

AUMLA

JOURNAL OF THE
AUSTRALASIAN UNIVERSITIES
LANGUAGE & LITERATURE
ASSOCIATION



NUMBER TWELVE NOVEMBER 1959

AUMLA

JOURNAL OF THE AUSTRALASIAN UNIVERSITIES
LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE ASSOCIATION

(AFFILIATED WITH THE F.I.L.L.M.)

*Formerly the Australasian Universities Modern
Languages Association*

A JOURNAL OF LITERARY CRITICISM, PHILOLOGY & LINGUISTICS

CONTENTS

THE NEW MENANDER: AN INTERIM REPORT

J. H. Quincey

page 3

MALLARMÉ: 'QUELLE SOIE AUX BAUMES DE TEMPS' (1885), *A. R. Chisholm*

17

A BICENTENARY: VOLTAIRE'S 'CANDIDE' 1759-1959

P. M. Conlon

20

LÉON CLADEL AND QUERCY, *R. T. Sussex*

30

WHAT IS FASTNACHTSPIEL? *D. M. van Abbé*

36

OSWALD VON WOLKENSTEIN AND 'MINNESANGS HERBST', *A. N. Brooks*

45

SOURCES AND SUBJECT MATTER IN TWO SHORT STORIES BY GEORG HEYM, *É. Krispyn*

52

THE PHONETIC AFFILIATIONS OF CZECH

58

BOOK REVIEWS

73

NOTES

102

INDEX

104

Number Twelve November 1959

Editor: R. T. SUSSEX

Associate Editor: I. H. SMITH

Editorial Board: K. F. QUINN, J. SMIT,
F. M. TODD

Manuscripts for publication forwarded to the Editor should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed return envelope, though the Editor can accept no responsibility for return of manuscripts. In accepting articles for publication the Editorial Board will normally give preference to those submitted by members of the Association.

Editorial Address:

DEPARTMENT OF MODERN LANGUAGES
UNIVERSITY OF CANTERBURY
CHRISTCHURCH NEW ZEALAND

Price to Non-Members:

10s. (Australian); 8s. (New Zealand)

AUMLA

*Journal of the Australasian Universities
Language & Literature Association*

NO. 12 NOVEMBER 1959

THE NEW MENANDER: AN INTERIM REPORT

J. H. QUINCEY

University of Sydney

FOR some years now the Classical world has been recovering substantial remains of literary and non-literary texts from the rubbish-tips of Greco-Roman Egypt, and become, perhaps, rather *blasé* in its acceptance of the regular quotas of new acquisitions. But the publication of Menander's *Dyskolos*¹ has provoked as much activity and excitement as the re-appearance of Aristotle's *Constitution of Athens* in the last century. Hitherto the Classicists had had to content themselves with such mutilated comedies as *Epitrepontes* and the *Perikeiromenē*, consisting of two-thirds and two-fifths of their originals respectively, but the new papyri, eleven sheets from a codex of the third century A.D., miraculously preserve the text of a comedy which is virtually complete.

The new 'find' has already aroused the interest of specialists in other literatures. Menander's contribution to the European comedy of manners has been universally recognised, and the *Epitrepontes* and *Perikeiromenē* have circulated widely in the English renderings by Gilbert Murray, *The Arbitration* and *The Rape of the Locks*. These versions have not, however, been unmixed blessings: Murray's restorations imported into the polished drama of a sophisticated age the primitive concepts of vegetation-ritual and earth-year spirit,² and have left many readers with a lasting misapprehension about Greek New Comedy. For them the new play will be particularly important; mutilations and corruptions of single lines are fairly numerous, but there will be no room here for 'imaginative reconstruction'.

A final assessment of the dramatic value and significance of

the *Dyskolos* must wait on the more technical processes of purifying the text, supplying the gaps with reasonable certainty and solving such nice problems as the correct distribution of lines between speakers. Whole batteries of scholars in Australia, in England and on the Continent have already gone into action; two more editions are promised. This kind of scholarship will take time, perhaps some years, to complete, and in the meantime many non-specialists in Greek will be anxious for a preview of the play's dramatic quality. In Australasia Professor T. B. L. Webster has recently supplied the need in part by attempting to fix the *Dyskolos* in its archaeological and literary setting,³ and has given a lead to the critics by directing attention to the intrusion of what he calls 'thug-comedy' in the last act. Webster has been cautious in his praise, and critical reaction elsewhere has not been effusive; H. Lloyd Jones, who is to edit the play, said frankly in a B.B.C. review, 'It is no use pretending that the *Dyskolos* is a great comedy'.⁴ The present article, which has been able to draw on the experience of the Sydney production of the *Dyskolos* in July of this year, is presented as an interim report on the purpose of the play and its place in Menander's development.

When Menander at the age of 20 produced his first play, the *Orgē*, at Athens in 321 B.C., Old Comedy was long since dead. Old Comedy had derived its life and inspiration from the day-to-day politics of an independent Athens who was mistress of an empire. Its strength had lain in brilliant flights of fancy executed in a sequence of rollicking episodes, plentifully seasoned with political and social satire on the eminent or the notorious; its weakness, for modern dramatic taste, lay in its heterogeneity. The structurally formal lyrics, and the formal address by the chorus-leader to the audience on political or related topics, were prescribed by tradition and fostered by the state-subsidy, they were the framework within which the playwright developed his action; but they curtailed his power to create or sustain dramatic illusion. After the fall of the Athenian empire in 404, a reduction of intensity of interest in current politics—even when the democracy was restored—accelerated a change in drama which would, perhaps, in the course of time have been produced by taste alone, a progressive decrease in the choral element and corresponding gains by the dramatic element. Political themes did not disappear, but, so far as we can judge, lost ground to mythological burlesque and domestic and social topics. Aristophanes' latest extant comedies, the *Ecclesiazusae* (391 B.C.: women in politics—not a topical issue) and the *Plutus* (388: a domestic comedy) both belong to the Middle and not the Old Comedy,⁵ and are symptomatic of

The New Menander: An Interim Report

the new trends. The formality of full choral structure has disappeared, and some of the lyrics written for the actual performance were not considered worthy of survival, being noted in the MSS by XOPOY, 'a song from the chorus'.⁶

It is reasonable to suppose that by the time Menander's dramatic career began, the chorus had already been reduced to the meagre rôle we find it playing in the *Epitrepontes*, only loosely connected with the action and arriving opportunely to terminate the acts and supply a song and dance as interlude.⁷ But it is not likely that the mature features of the comedy of manners familiar to us in the fragments of the later plays and from the Roman adaptations of Plautus and Terence were to be found in his earliest work. His genius at its acme was best revealed in the intricate variety of his love-themes, extending from tender domesticity to brutal rape, inheriting from Euripidean tragedy such ancillary items as the exposure of unwanted children in the wilds and their ultimate recognition through amateur detective work with their clothes and ornaments. His characters, young men in love, maidens in trouble, the free-born and the well-to-do, the servants and the cooks, are, in his mature work, developed with a remarkable simplicity and sympathy to the extent required by the action; the Hellenistic world is brought to life. All this Menander did not accomplish from the outset of his career; he was born into the Middle Comedy, and probably his early efforts followed the Middle with its emphasis on single-character themes and themes of adventure.⁸ But the evolution of the fully-fledged New Comedy cannot have taken many years, for Menander's 100 or so plays were written between 321 and 292. It remains to be seen whether there are any traces of this evolution in the *Dyskolos*, which gained the first prize at the Lenaeon Festival in 316⁹—the first dramatic victory we can ascribe to him with certainty.

The text of the play is prefixed in our manuscript by a metrical hypothesis of twelve lines, purporting to summarise the main features of the action and to have been composed by Aristophanes the grammarian. The ascription, however, must be false; Aristophanes could not have been responsible for such a vague and misleading summary of the plot.¹⁰ The historical details which follow are more reliable, since they must derive ultimately from official records: we are given the date of the first performance at the Lenaea, where it gained the prize, the name of the principal actor, Aristodemos of Scarphe, and an alternative title for the piece: *The Bad-Tempered Man* or *The Misanthrope*. Finally comes a list of the speaking characters in the order of appearance; one character is missing, the Mother of Sostratos, to whom

W. Ritchie rightly, I think, allocates lines 430-1, 432-4 and 438-441.¹¹

The scene is the country track before the shrine of Pan and the Nymphs at Phylē on Mt. Parnes in Attica. Perhaps the shrine was depicted on rising ground, as Miss P. J. Photiades has suggested,¹² but there is no proof of this in the text.¹³ To the audience's right is the house of the bad-tempered man, Knemon, to their left the house of his stepson Gorgias.¹⁴ The right exit leads to the fields (cf. 87), the left to Phyle.

THE PROLOGUE

Pan Steps forward from his shrine to give the audience the 'programme'. He identifies the scene and then passes on to the action. Knemon, he says, had some years before married a widow with a small son, but despite the birth of a daughter the marriage had not been a success because of his bad temper, and his wife had left him to live in poverty with her son Gorgias, now grown to manhood and working hard for a living with a family retainer (Daos). Knemon, who, we shall learn later (327 ff.), is comparatively well-off, has declared war on humanity. Besides his daughter he maintains only a house-keeper (Simikē) and works his land alone; he even refuses to give his daughter in marriage, until he can find a suitor whose outlook matches his own, as we shall learn in 336-7.

On a recent hunting trip, Sostratos, the young son of a wealthy land-owner in Phylē (39-41), saw Knemon's daughter and was made by Pan to fall in love with her, for Pan and the Nymphs are bent on rewarding her piety towards them with marriage.

Pan now withdraws before the arrival of Sostratos and a fellow-hunter, Chaireas.

ACT I

The opening conversation between Sostratos and Chaireas, who pretends to some experience in love affairs, reveals that Sostratos has sent a servant, Pyrrhias, to investigate his beloved's *ménage*. Pyrrhias enters (81), with Knemon not far behind, to report that he has tried to interview Knemon on his land, but has been pelted with stones, clods and wild-pears. Chaireas withdraws in cowardice (144), but Sostratos, undeterred, faces the 'terror'. Knemon delivers an harangue, which stamps his character, and marches indoors. Sostratos decides to return home and enlist the help of his father's servant, Getas, but, before he goes, another opportunity comes his way: Knemon's daughter steps out of the

The New Menander: An Interim Report

house to draw water at the shrine, for the house-keeper has dropped the pitcher down the well. But before anything like a love-scene can develop, Daos intervenes. *Exeunt* Sostratos and Pyrrhias to fetch Getas, and Daos to report the incident to his master.

The arrival of the chorus of devotees of Pan, heralded with a stereotyped formula,¹⁵ closes the act.

Choral Interlude

ACT II

Gorgias and Daos return from the fields in conversation; the dialogue serves to emphasise Knemon's character and Gorgias's solicitude for his stepsister. Enter Sostratos, soliloquising,¹⁶ without Getas: his mother, whose hobby is religious celebrations at country shrines, had sent Getas out to hire a cook for a sacrificial expedition. He now intends to make a direct approach to Knemon, but is interrupted by Gorgias, who suspects him of dishonourable intentions. After a sharp exchange the suspicions are dispelled and Gorgias becomes his ally. *Exit* Sostratos with a mattock to work in the fields with Gorgias, in the hope of pleading his case with Knemon in the rôle of peasant farmer.

Enter now the hired cook, Sikon, with a live sheep, followed by Getas. Sostratos's mother has, it seems, seen a vision of Pan of Phylê enslaving Sostratos, and is to sacrifice in this shrine.

Choral Interlude

ACT III

Knemon, on his way to work, is forced by the arrival of Sostratos's mother with her sacrificial procession to stay at home and watch his household goods.¹⁷ His fears are justified: first Getas and then Sikon knock to ask for loans of kitchenware, and are repulsed.

Sostratos re-enters to report that, despite a hard morning's dig, he has not seen Knemon. He comes back still 'under the spell of the place' to be told by Getas that dinner is being prepared for his mother in the shrine and that his father, too, is expected. He goes off to invite Gorgias and Daos.

Enter Simikē, screaming. She has tried to fish the pitcher out of the well with Knemon's mattock—and dropped the mattock down too. Knemon chases her indoors; he has no-one to help, but will go down the well himself.¹⁸

Gorgias returns with Daos and Sostratos, but declines the invitation to dinner, since he must attend to his mother's wants.

Choral Interlude

ACT IV

'Knemon's in the well!' shrieks Simikē. Sikon refuses to help, and expatiates on divine vengeance and the Providence which watches over cooks, while the old man is rescued by Gorgias and Sostratos. Knemon is brought on injured and, feeling that he is likely to die, summons his family about him. He delivers a long *apologia* which is partly self-justification but mainly contrition, consigns his estate and his daughter to Gorgias's guardianship and withdraws to end his days in solitude.

Gorgias seizes the opportunity to betroth his sister to Sostratos. Callippides, Sostratos's father, arrives for his dinner, and Sostratos goes in to get his consent to the marriage.

Choral Interlude

ACT V

Sostratos, having clinched his own marriage-deal, induces Callippides to consent to a further union between Gorgias and his daughter.¹⁹ Gorgias is soon won over by Callippides, the settlements are made and the marriages scheduled for the next day. In the meantime a feast and a carousal are planned. The two families congregate in the shrine and Knemon is deserted; he refuses to attend and sends Simikē over to complete his isolation.

With the music and the merry-making as a background, Getas and Sikon now go through an elaborate formula of revenge. They quietly bring the invalid outside (so that the audience can enjoy his reactions), and then batter on his door and bawl for loans of utensils and furniture. To crown it, they threaten to make him dance, and so induce him to consent to the lesser of two evils, joining the party in the shrine.

And so, as Knemon is carried inside, they score a victory which looks to the victory which Menander hopes to win over his fellow-competitors at the dramatic festival.²⁰

The action of the play is sustained around two interdependent themes. Sostratos's determination to marry the daughter of Knemon, and the problem of Knemon's character. The former theme is the familiar tale of love triumphant over a succession of obstacles. Sostratos's attempt to reconnoitre the ground through Pyrrhias comes to naught, his friend Chaireas, on whom he relies for expert advice and help (55-57), proves a broken reed, his personal interview with Knemon flops (167 ff.) his interlude with the daughter is interrupted before it can develop,²¹ he cannot find Getas when he needs his help (259), and his 'incursion on the agricultural scene' for a day's work with a mattock in the hot sun brings no

immediate results. But despite his naïve inexperience he has the qualities necessary to carry him through: his honesty recommends him to Gorgias, with his exacting moral standards, and his determination prevails against Gorgias's gloomy prognostications of failure (320-92). If he missed his interview with Knemon in the fields, he did at least acquire enough tan on the face to look like the sort of suitor that Knemon would approve of.²² Throughout the piece he breathes Pan's spirit of philanthropy,²³ contrasting with the misanthropy of Knemon, and in that spirit helps to rescue Knemon from the well—and then modestly disclaims much responsibility (666-85).

Sostratos's character is drawn in sufficient detail, and his adventures, if simple, are sufficiently amusing to serve almost as the *raison d'être* of the play. Almost: they need a heightening of the love-interest to complete the audience's sympathy. And, on the score of love-interest, it is significant that Menander has given us the bare minimum required to render the action intelligible. Miss Photiades, indeed, includes Knemon's daughter in the category of the 'four main characters' outlined in the prologue, 'so that we may be prepared for their full portrayal'.²⁴ But where is the daughter portrayed? In 189-213 she is allocated about twelve lines,²⁵ bearing mainly on some water she has to boil and a domestic mishap with a pitcher, and in 648-9 her voice is heard 'off' crying, 'Don't say he's dead! Please save my darling Daddy!' She is on stage from 690 to 760 but says nothing. For the rest she is mute and unseen—and nameless, if, as seems likely, the Myrrhine (?) mentioned in 709 is Knemon's wife. In the betrothal scene her feeling for Sostratos is no more relevant a factor than is Sostratos's sister's feeling for Gorgias. The women are traded like sheep, and the daughter, in fact, has no more 'characterisation' than the sheep which Sikon drags into the shrine. Menander knew well enough how to draw female characters—witness Habrotonon and Pamphilē in the *Epi-trepontes*—but he has chosen to leave the daughter as she appears in the Prologue, a nebulous outline of rustic gentility and piety.

Extra light on the relative importance of the two themes is shed by Menander's arrangement of his dramatic material. We have virtually finished with Sostratos's love for the daughter by the end of Act IV. Callippides's consent to the union and the actual celebration of the marriage, though important for Sostratos, both lie outside the action presented.²⁶ Act V falls into two distinct scenes: the first (784-873) deals mainly with the minor issue of Gorgias's marriage, the second with the much more important intrigue of Getas and Sikon. Continuity between the two scenes is maintained by Simikē, leaving Knemon to join the marriage-party, and Getas.

leaving the marriage-party to visit Knemon, but the transition of the two characters signals a transition of mood, from Menander at his most sententious to Menander at his most boisterous. The change in mood is underlined by two simple devices, the commencement of a flute accompaniment,²⁷ which is surely sustained to the end of the play and not merely a solo interlude on Pan's flute, as Miss Photiades holds,²⁸ and the transition from iambic trimeters to iambic tetrameters. With the advent of the music and the tetrameters the dialogue moves from the dignified level of conversation to the playful rapidity of a children's game;²⁹ it rises to a quasi-lyrical pitch in 938-953, and subsides again at 958, where its purpose is achieved, into the trimeters for the *envoi*.

What is the purpose of this scene? The outburst of Knemon-baiting is justified by Getas partly as revenge for the old man's refusal to lend his pots and pans earlier in the action, and partly by the need to tame Knemon now that he is to become one of the family:

'In short, we have to make the monster more domesticated; We've got him as an 'in-law' now, he's joined the family circle. And if he won't improve, he'll be so much dead weight to carry.'³⁰

This is adequate enough as a dramatic pretext, but Menander could have represented Knemon as a completely reformed character in Act IV, and so have made the process of vengeance and domestication superfluous. But yet, if he had done so, what he gained in good taste he would have lost in dramatic effect. The audience must be sent on its way home not in quiet contentment with love's labours rewarded, but in the traditional atmosphere of active merrymaking. Menander manages this element skilfully enough in the *Dyskolos*, mainly through Simikē, Sikon and Getas, by recurring variations on simple comic themes: the pitcher fell down the well (190-1), the mattock fell down the well (574 ff.), Knemon fell down the well (620 ff.); Getas tried to borrow from Knemon (456-80), Sikon tried to borrow (487-521) and in the final scene the borrowing-theme becomes a *moto perpetuo*. To reserve Knemon for separate comic treatment at the end is good drama.

But is it good taste? Knemon left the stage in Act IV an invalid, still apprehensive that he was going to die (729-30), and we may find it hard to condone the treatment meted out to him in Act V, just as we may find it repulsive that Sikon wished that Knemon's accident would leave him crippled (660-5), or that Sostratos was so *insouciant* about the old man's plight in the well (678-9). In our code, and in the Greek code too, it is definitely unsporting to trample on a man when he is down.³¹ Menander saw the difficulty,

forced on him by comic necessity, and went a long way towards solving it. Knemon, who is sufficiently shaken in Act IV to renounce his rights as paterfamilias to Gorgias, is said by Getas (894), before the attack takes place, to be 'not in such a bad condition'.³² His injuries prevent him from rising without assistance (914-5, 928-9, 934), but, despite the views of Webster³³ and Miss Photiades,³⁴ there is nothing in the text to prove that Getas and Sikon do him any violence. They may have taken hold of his hands, or lifted his couch and executed a short dance movement at 954-5; but he is intimidated, not manhandled.

The final scene also finds some justification in Menander's overall design. The dramatic theme of Knemon's character, which gives the piece its title, was for him more important than Sostratos's love story, and must therefore be reserved for separate treatment in the last act. The comic play of the servant and the cook leads to the very climax of the action. In his long speech in Act IV (about 706 ff.) Knemon gives us his *apologia pro vita sua*, the importance of which is signalled by the metrical change to trochaic tetrameters and by its moralising tone; like an Aristophanic parabasis it looks beyond its dramatic context. The *apologia* still maintains, perhaps, the principle of self-help,³⁵ but repudiates self-sufficiency (713 ff.); it accepts the principle of neighbourliness, but repudiates it in practice, for Knemon withdraws to a life of solitude. His accident has induced in him a partial change of attitude, but no corresponding change in his ways. To change his ways is precisely what Getas and Sikon set out to do in Act V, and the final consent is presented to us as voluntary (957), even if it is for Knemon the willing of the lesser of two evils.

Ordinary Greek usage of language identified a man's ways (*τρόποι*) with his character, and the current ethical theory of Aristotle asserted the paradox that men become virtuous by habituation in virtuous actions.³⁶ The comic theme and the serious theme find simultaneous fulfilment in a like paradox, forcible conversion, and if the treatment seems too harsh, then the drama gains correspondingly by the sympathy engendered in the audience for Knemon; so it is for Shylock.³⁷

The *Dyskolos*, then, is a social comedy in a special sense, a study of sociability triumphant over unsociability; against Knemon is set Pan's spirit of rustic festivity and goodwill, working through the agency of human beings.³⁸ To look for literary ancestry for a comedy of this sort may appear *prima facie* to be an excess of scholarship, for there is scarcely anything in it which could not have been lifted from contemporary life. Even Knemon, who is said by Gorgias to be unique (323-5), could have been suggested to

Menander by many a strenuous and irascible old farmer of Attica in his own day. But, as Webster has already suggested,³⁹ the character and the plot of the *Dyskolos* owe a large debt to the misanthropic Timon, who lived at Athens during the Periclean age and passed into the legend and literature of his countrymen long before he reached the Shakespearean corpus. The derivation has now been examined by W. Schmid⁴⁰ and must be accepted as proved. One example of the detail will suffice: Knemon's pear-collecting (101) and his withdrawal from human society after his accident look to the tradition, recorded by Neanthes, that Timon was injured in a fall from a wild pear-tree, refused medical treatment and died of gangrene.⁴¹ The hermit-theme based on the life of Timon had been successfully handled at least three times already on the Athenian stage, by Phrynichos in the Old Comedy (414 B.C.) and by Mnesimachos and Antiphanes in the Middle. The treatment given to the theme here suggests an intermediate stage between the burlesque of the Middle and the greater resources and complexity of the developed New Comedy.

Some of the characters, too, betray the author's immaturity. Menander's pithy maxims were much admired, and quoted, in antiquity, but both the priggish Gorgias⁴² and the naïve Sostratos⁴³ are prone to sententiousness, which only the incisive good sense of Callippides can cut short.⁴⁴ Some of the time expended unproductively on these two could have been better devoted to a scene between Knemon and his daughter, which we lack altogether, or between Sostratos and the daughter, for the brief interlude 189-213 serves merely to whet our appetite for more. But, from the standpoint of historical development, Getas and Sikon are likely to prove the most interesting characters to study. Getas is a household servant who probably had charge of Sostratos when he was a boy⁴⁵ and is still esteemed by Sostratos for his experience and resource.⁴⁶ The advance mention of him in 182 leads us to suppose that his rôle in the action will be to scheme and contrive under Sostratos's direction, but it is not to be so. The gentleman's gentleman had by now achieved that dramatic independence which had been foreshadowed in the Old Comedy by such slaves as Xanthias in the *Frogs*.⁴⁷ The reason for his emancipation is not hard to find: the New Comedy could not exist without some subterfuge, dishonesty and—at this stage of its development—controlled horse-play, and the dirty work must now be delegated to the servants and not taint the free-born young men of upright character, such as Gorgias or Sostratos. It is clear from the dialogue between Sikon and Getas which precedes the 'attack' on Knemon that the young men would not condone the scheme:

The New Menander: An Interim Report

SIC. But I'm afraid that Gorgias will catch us
And give us both a dressing-down.

GET. Not likely, with the racket

That drinking party's making. No, nobody will be the wiser.⁴⁸

Getas, in the traditional fashion, harps on his chores and his hunger; he is the factotum overworked and underfed, whose perpetual desire for a good meal is not to be satisfied until, at least, the action is over.⁴⁹ In his relationship to Sikon he stands as *βωμολόχος*, the scrounger who cared nothing for his dignity, to *ἀλαζών*, the braggart who claimed more dignity than he was entitled to, a 'Laurel-and-Hardy' combination, well-known from the Old Comedy.⁵⁰ Sikon aspires to the dignity of the old sacrificial priesthood,⁵¹ he is a hireling whose ritual carving has lost its prestige through progressive secularisation, a pompous humbug who claims all kinds of *savoir-faire*:

Swore at you, did he? Damn you! You're to blame,
I suppose, for asking like a guttersnipe.
Some people haven't the knack; I've got it taped—
Applied psychology! There are hundreds of
Families in town I cater for and whose
Neighbours I pester, all of them, for loans
Of pots and pans, and get them! Borrowers
Have got to use soft-soap. Say an old man
Answers the door, I call him 'sir' straight off . . .⁵²

but when the test comes, he is timid and resourceless and reduced to patent face-saving formulae (515-21). In the last scene it is Getas who takes the lead and shows the courage necessary to execute the plot (888 ff.).

Here, too, the *Dyskolos* shows an earlier stage of Menander's development. Later household slaves rise to greater heights of audacity and intrigue. In the *Epitrepontes* Onesimos, one of the hinges of the plot, juggles brazenly with the intimate affairs of his master, his mistress and her father, Smikrines; Cario, the cook, plays a subordinate rôle. The old comic *motif* yields eventually to pure considerations of plot. Nor is Menander particularly adept or inventive in the dialogue assigned to the pair: their characters, though well-depicted, are not reinforced by attention to the vernacular idiom of the lower classes. This, despite Zini's attempt to prove the reverse by analysis of the 'pre-Dyskolos' remains,⁵³ seems to be true of all Menander's work; the language captivates with its simplicity and refinement, but is rarely adapted to character. The comic dialogue, while it may raise a titter amongst the unin-

initiated, proves on examination to be strangely hackneyed: the baggage-joke (402-6 and 419-20) had already been fully exploited by Aristophanes. *Frogs* 1-34, the entry with a sheep turns up again at *Samia* 184 ff. with a verbal echo,⁵⁴ and the pun at 398, 'the sheep's made mincemeat out of a cook', is inflicted on us with a variation again at 410. Menander's *forte* is not sparkling wit, but delicate humour.

The new play, then, is not a masterpiece, nor is it Menander at his best. The choice of a theme already well-known to the Athenian theatre suggests, perhaps, a youthful diffidence, although the persistent fourth-century interest in the philosophical problem of the individual's relation to society made it still a living, topical issue.⁵⁵ But the straight-forward execution of the theme is certainly more in keeping with Middle Comedy than the New; there is nothing here to suggest Menander's magical dexterity with knots typical of his later work. In characterisation, too, Menander has not reached his zenith. The men are somewhat over-elaborated and the women shadows in comparison. Even if Knemon's redemption can be managed on these terms, the critics will regret that none of the speaking women, the daughter, Simikē and the mother of Sostrotos, is developed to the life. On the credit side can be set the effective conversion of humdrum themes of everyday life, importunate neighbours 'on the borrow' and accidents at a well, into good comic material by cumulative repetition, and the remarkable economy and facility of transition which enable Menander to achieve so much in less than a thousand lines. With the exceptions noticed, the action moves smoothly and rapidly. The ultimate convergence of the serious and the comic is particularly neat, and makes the play good theatre; at least, a Greek performance before a Greek-less audience in Sydney brought the house down.⁵⁶

NOTES

¹ Ed. Prof. V. Martin (Geneva, 1958). The translations into English, French and German which are included are worthless.

² Cf. *Ritual Elements in the New Comedy*, C.Q. 37, 46-54. Webster on p.8 of *The Birth of Modern Comedy of Manners* (Australian Humanities Research Council, 1959, Occasional Paper No. 1; subsequent reference will be to Canberra Paper 1) seems too tolerant of Murray's views.

³ *Op. cit.*

⁴ Reported in *The Listener*, May 14, 1959, 837-8.

The New Menander: An Interim Report

- ⁵ The terminology Old, Middle and New derives from Platonius, *Diff. Com.* The divisions are real, not academic, but some trends are continuous.
- ⁶ *Eccles.* 729, 876; *Plut.* 321, 626. 770 (KOMMATION XOPOY) 801, 958, 1096. See K. J. Maidment, *The Later Comic Chorus, C.Q.* 29, 1-24.
- ⁷ *Epitrep.* 36 K., 242 K.
- ⁸ Webster, *Studies in Menander*, 109 ff.
- ⁹ The archon's name in the *didascalia* must be emended: Martin p. 13.
- ¹⁰ Cf. G. Zuntz *The Political Plays of Euripides*, 129 ff.
- ¹¹ *Notes on the Dyskolos of Menander* by J. H. Quincey, W. Ritchie, G. P. Shipp and A. P. Treweek (Australian Humanities Research Council, 1959, Occasional Paper No. 2 (forthcoming); subsequent reference will be to Canberra Paper 2).
- ¹² *Pan's Prologue to the Dyskolos, Greece and Rome* v (1958), p. 112.
- ¹³ Punctuate after αὐτῶν (939) and read e.g. μικρ[ὸν δ'] ἀνωθεν κ.τ.λ. in 940.
- ¹⁴ Canberra Paper 2, my note on 1. 5; but the issue is still *sub judice*.
- ¹⁵ Cf. *Epitrep.* 33-35 K.
- ¹⁶ Martin is wrong to introduce Pyrrhias at 300.
- ¹⁷ Reading τηρητέ[ε]ον in 454, but see my note *ad loc.* in Canberra Paper 2.
- ¹⁸ Shipp's note in Canberra Paper 2.
- ¹⁹ She may be the Plangon mentioned in 430; see Ritchie, *op. cit.*
- ²⁰ Another routine idea, as in the Old Comedy: e.g. Ar. *Ach.* See also E. Vogt, *Ein Stereotyper Dramenschluss der Νέα, Rhein. Mus.* 102, 192.
- ²¹ Hence οἱμοι κακοδαίμων in 214.
- ²² 754-7; read e.g. Κν. εὖ γε νῆ] Δε' οὐ ποεῖ τοῦ[το in 757.
- ²³ P. J. Photiades *op. cit.*
- ²⁴ *Op. cit.* p. 113.
- ²⁵ The text in 201 is not yet cleared up.
- ²⁶ 781-2, 784-6, 851-2.
- ²⁷ Indicated by αὐλεῖ in the manuscript.
- ²⁸ *Op. cit.* p. 116
- ²⁹ Such a game may, in fact, have inspired the scene.
- ³⁰ 902-5; I adopt in 903 the emendation ἡμερωτέος which, I believe, is to be proposed by R. Kassel in *Rhein. Mus.* (forthcoming).
- ³¹ E.g. ἐπεμπεδᾶν κειμένῳ, Ar. *Clouds* 550.
- ³² οὐ παντάπασιν ἀθλίως
- ³³ Canberra Paper 2, p. 6.
- ³⁴ *Op. cit.* p. 116.
- ³⁵ 710-11; I have proposed e.g. εἰ[γεωργεῖν τοῦμὸν αὐτὸς χωριο]ν προειλόμην in 710.
- ³⁶ *Eth. Nic.* 1103 a-b. Miss Photiades p. 119 says that Knemon remains a misanthrope at heart, appealing to his 'last words' at 930; but his last words are 957-8.

³⁷ Cf. Webster, Canberra Paper 1, p. 4.

³⁸ Fully discussed by Miss Photiades.

³⁹ *Op. cit.* p. 7.

⁴⁰ Menanders *Dyskolos* und die *Timonlegende*, *Rhein. Mus.* 102, 157-82.

⁴¹ Neanthes Περὶ Ἐνδόξων Ἀνδρῶν cited by schol. Ar. *Lys.* 808. Plutarch *Ant.* 70, the source of Shakespeare, also derives from Neanthes.

⁴² E.g. 239 ff.

⁴³ E.g. 797 ff.

⁴⁴ 817, 834-5; for a tentative restoration of the latter passage see my note in Canberra Paper 2.

⁴⁵ Cf. *τρόφιμος* (553).

⁴⁶ 183-4, with the reading given by Shipp, *op. cit.*

⁴⁷ See especially 738-53.

⁴⁸ 900-2.

⁴⁹ 425-6, 563-70.

⁵⁰ E.g. Strepsiades and Socrates in the *Clouds*.

⁵¹ 422-3, 639-47. See also on cooks M. Treu, *Ein Komödienmotiv in zwei Papyri*, *Philol.* 102, 215-39 (I owe this reference to Prof. Webster).

⁵² 487-94.

⁵³ *Il Linguaggio dei Personaggi nelle Commedie di Menandro* (Firenze, 1938).

⁵⁴ Cf. also *Dysk.* 451-3.

⁵⁵ Aristotle *Eth. Nic.* 1097 b8-11, treating of εὐδαιμονία, would serve as a text for the play:

τὸ δ' αὐταρκες λέγομεν οὐκ αὐτῷ, τῷ ξῶντι βιον μονώτην, ἀλλὰ καὶ
γονεῦσι καὶ τέκνοις καὶ γυναικὶ καὶ ὅλως τοῖς ψίλοις καὶ πολιταῖς,
ἐπειδὴ πολιτικὸν ὁ ἄνθρωπος.

⁵⁶ During the preparation of this article the writer has been much indebted to Dr W. Ritchie for many useful suggestions, but for the views expressed, and for any errors which remain, he accepts sole responsibility.

MALLARMÉ: 'QUELLE SOIE AUX BAUMES DE TEMPS' (1885)

A. R. CHISHOLM

University of Melbourne

Quelle soie aux baumes de temps
Où la Chimère s'exténue
Vaut la torse et native nue
Que, hors de ton miroir, tu tends!

Les trous de drapeaux méditants
S'exaltent dans notre avenue:
Moi, j'ai ta chevelure nue
Pour enfouir mes yeux contents.

Non! La bouche ne sera sûre
De rien goûter à sa morsure,
S'il ne fait, ton princier amant,

Dans la considérable touffe
Expirer, comme un diamant,
Le cri des gloires qu'il étouffe.

OF the three commentators quoted in the *Oeuvres complètes* by Mondor and Jean-Aubry, Camille Soula offers the most useful clue to the elucidation of this sonnet when he writes: 'Le symbole des cheveux féminins établit un pont entre la réalité et la Chimère.' But too many exegetes go astray when they assume that Mallarmé here, for once, crosses the bridge and prefers reality to the dream, sensuality to art. Thus Jean Royère, also quoted in the Mondor edition, affirms that this is a 'cantique où bondit l'amant comme hors du poète et sur son cadavre'.

All the evidence is against this, not only in the group of sonnets (approximately 1885-87) to which Mallarmé assigned 'Quelle soie', but even in the early *Pître châtié*; in all these, the dreamer, the idealist, the artist triumphs over the lover.

The sonnet might well have been called, borrowing M. Soula's phrase, 'La Réalité et la Chimère'. The Chimaera, the creative dream, appears on three levels of correspondence (in the technical, Symbolist sense of the term): as the dream of the patient artist, still dimly visible in the piece of exquisitely flowered silk that he wove; as the dream of the soldier, seeking the bubble reputation; as the dream of the poet, echoing and summing up the other two dreams in the one word 'Gloires', that rings out like a trumpet-call in spite

of the verb 'étouffe'. Sensuous reality, on the other hand, is represented by only one symbol: 'ta chevelure nue.' We can now look at the 'meaning' of the sonnet.

A phrase in the fourth line puzzled me for many years: 'Hors de ton miroir', to which the poet gives special prominence by placing it between two commas, despite his habitual economy in punctuation. It implies, I now think, by correspondence, another vision of the 'torse et native nue', *inside* the mirror. We have to imagine that as the lady of the sonnet sits in her boudoir, the poet first sees her golden cloud of hair reflected in the mirror and thus kept in its proper artistic domain, as something beyond tangible reality. But his eyes move from this mirrored hair to the hair itself, outside the mirror, in all its resplendent, naked animality; and his sensual instinct tempts him for a moment to forget his dream-world and plunge his face into this golden cloud.

Hence the almost tumultuous art-renunciation expressed in the two quatrains: no work of art, no dream can be as beautiful and as satisfying ('mes yeux *contents*') as sensual reality presented in so glorious a form. The work of art that he evokes is a piece of flowered silk into which some artist of long ago expressed his creative dream; the perfume of the centuries ('baumes de temps') clings to it like an aroma of eternity; and though the dream that created it is now almost forgotten ('s'exténue': Latin *extenuere*, to reduce, rarefy), it is still faintly visible. But the sensualist in Mallarmé's soul cries out that even this silken beauty is less than that of a woman's hair, which has been woven not by an artist, with his human imperfections, but by Nature herself ('la . . . *native nue*').

He evokes a second dream, that of the soldier, seen in the flags that are exalted 'dans notre avenue'; but he subordinates it, as the artist's dream had been subordinated, to 'ta chevelure nue'. I am inclined to think that the uplifting of the flags is a correspondence for the lifting of the cloud of hair out of the mirror; and the holes in the flags, through which one sees past epics and dreams of glory, are rather like the magical cavity of a mirror, in which one sees another world.

And now comes the turning-point of the sonnet, in the one emphatic word 'Non!' We could paraphrase it prosaically in English by some such expression as 'That's all very well, but . . .' Mallarmé frequently uses an unexpected monosyllable, at times deliberately flat, to mark a turning-point. The 'argument' of the tercets is, I believe, as follows: No! this gleaming, real hair, not in the mirror, but so close, waiting to be embraced, offers a marvellous reward to the sensualist; but the price would be too high. The pleasure thus offered would not be complete.

Mallarmé: 'Quelle soie aux baumes de temps'

La bouche ne sera sûre
De rien goûter à sa morsure,

unless the lover sacrificed his dreams to it; unless he stifled the cry of his artistic aspirations; unless, like a prince throwing away wealth for a woman's sake, he covered up the diamond-splendour of his genius, and forswore all that by which creative dreamers live.

So much for the general intention of this compact sonnet. A few details remain to be examined. Thus, when in the opening lines Mallarmé evokes a piece of silk, he possibly has in mind some patient, long-forgotten Chinese artist; for in an earlier version of the sonnet, published in 1946 by Eileen Souffrin, the first two lines are:

De l'Orient passé des Temps
Nulle étoffe jamais venue,

where 'Orient' can have both a literal and a metaphorical sense. Another detail worth pointing out is that as he moves downward in the quatrains towards an anti-artistic abyss of sensuality, the woman's hair is transformed from a shimmering cloud into something much more substantial and graspable: 'ta chevelure nue'.

Again, there is a correspondence which is all the more beautiful for being unexpressed. In a sonnet so full of correspondences and echoes we should expect a pendant for 'aux baumes de temps'. To find it, we have to look again at that curious phrase, 'hors de ton miroir'. As the idealised hair in the mirror emerges and becomes real, it brings with it its subtle perfume; and a perfume is essentially a 'baume de temps', having been created by a long process of distillation.

One problem remains: Why does Mallarmé attach that apparently banal adjective, 'considérable', to the rather unpoetic 'touffe'? 'Touffe' is deliberately flat: the artist is taking himself to task for having been tempted to undervalue the Chimaeras and the Glories to what is, after all, only a mass of matter. This gleaming mass is something to be *looked at* (the real, etymological meaning of 'considérable'), and no more. Its only value consists in being an inspiration for dreams and idealisations. It is like the bare breast in 'Mes bouquins refermés', which, as the firelight falls on it, suggests to the poet not so much the pleasure of sensual passion as the burnt breast of an Amazon, lost in the mists of mythology.

In other words, the potential lover is once more like that 'pitre châtie' who looked into a woman's eyes and thought that he had found life; but in reality he had merely sacrificed his genius:

. C'était tout mon sacre,
Ce fard noyé dans l'eau perfide des glaciers.

A BICENTENARY: VOLTAIRE'S 'CANDIDE'

1759-1959

P. M. CONLON

Victoria University of Wellington

Ah! dit Rieux, on ne peut pas en même temps guérir et savoir. Alors guérissons le plus vite possible. C'est le plus pressé. ALBERT CAMUS.

IT IS now two hundred years ago that Voltaire published his philosophical tale, *Candide, ou l'Optimisme*. This brief work, which appeared towards the beginning of February 1759, was printed first in Geneva and then in Paris¹. It immediately proved to be an extraordinary success. A friend wrote from Paris to Voltaire: 'On s'arrache votre ouvrage des mains. Il tient le cœur gai au point de faire rire à bouche ouverte ceux qui ne rient que du bout des dents'.² The work was then reprinted, so that there were 'about twenty editions, impressions, issues bearing the date 1759'.³ It was translated into English by May 1759, and was then printed four times in England and Scotland in the course of that year⁴. The success of *Candide* has proved a lasting one. The work is issued in a multiplicity of editions—for students and scholars, for the general public, and in collectors' editions with startling illustrations.

What would Voltaire have thought of *Candide's* remarkable popularity? It is in no way presumptuous to say that he would have been proud, justifiably, but very surprised. He believed, it is true, that posterity would have the good taste to admire him. In this belief he was right, but for the wrong reason. Along with his contemporaries, he was convinced that his posthumous fame would rest unshakably on his twenty or thirty tragedies, and on his unique epic poem, *La Henriade*. Posterity has decided otherwise. Contrary to this earlier expectation, it prefers a philosophical tale, a polemic writing which was thought to be above all of contemporary and, therefore, passing interest.

Candide appeared without having first been submitted to the astonished gaze of the censors in Geneva and Paris.⁵ Consequently, it was printed without the name of its author. However, if Voltaire was careful not to furnish judicial proof of authorship, he was equally careful to make his anonymity transparent. Beneath the title of his work, he added the bantering note: 'Traduit de l'allemand de M. le docteur Ralph, avec les additions qu'on a trouvées dans la poche du docteur lorsqu'il mourut à Minden, l'an de grâce

1759.' This mock seriousness and studied accuracy were familiar to Voltaire's readers, and were tantamount to a signature. *Candide* was immediately attributed to him.

It has been said, and is repeated, that Voltaire wrote *Candide* in three days and in three nights. We are asked to imagine that a lean, bent and grimacing Voltaire shut himself up in his study, and left it neither for meals nor for sleep until he emerged blessed with his new-born *Candide*. This account belongs to legend. If Voltaire could write out a tragedy, *Rome sauvée*, in a week, and in verse,⁶ it is established that he nevertheless spent something like a month preparing the first draft of *Candide*.⁷

The hero of *Candide ou l'optimisme* appears in the very first chapter:

Il y avait en Westphalie, dans le château de M. le baron Thunder-ten-Tronckh, un jeune garçon à qui la nature avait donné les mœurs les plus douces. Sa physionomie annonçait son âme. Il avait le jugement assez droit avec l'esprit le plus simple : c'est je crois pour cette raison qu'on le nommait Candide.

Upright and trusting, Candide had moreover acquired great wisdom by listening in rapture to the sublime reasoning of Pangloss who, the finest philosopher in backward Westphalia, taught 'la métaphysico-théologo-cosmolo-nigologie'. Voltaire uses this comically meaningless expression to designate the philosophy of optimism, formulated by Leibnitz in his *Théodicée* (1710).

In this work, Leibnitz did two things of interest to us: he rejected the Christian view on the origin of evil, and then sought to explain in his own way the existence of evil in the world. He believed that God in His goodness created the world, and that God in His wisdom made it imperfect. Leibnitz then demonstrated that this bizarre creative gesture could be explained logically. Evil, he claimed, is the counterpart of good, without which good would not be perceptible. It should be added, and this is indeed reassuring, that evil in the world is in minute proportion as compared with good—only that proportion which is necessary to make man perceive the abundance of good. It may be that a person suffers grievous misfortune, and inveighs against a cruel creator. Such a person would be in error: God is able to embrace all creation at a glance and, in His eyes, all is for the best, and this is the best of possible worlds.

Such, in the broadest outline, was the philosophy of Leibnitz, and of Pangloss. Candide, 'avec toute la bonne foi de son âge et de son caractère', embraced this heartening view all the more readily as he had fallen in love with the fair Cunégonde, the baron's

daughter. But he failed to win her hand. Instead, he received her father's boot, for he was literally kicked out of this earthly paradise in Westphalia by her wrathful procreator. Shortly afterwards, an invading army over-ran the castle and dispersed its inhabitants. Candide then set off in search of Cunégonde, that is to say, in search of happiness. It enabled him, in the light of his singular experiences, to examine and comment on a remarkable variety of topics, from the comical arrogance of petty German nobility to the violence employed by the Jesuits in exercising temporal power in South America. However, *Candide* is above all devoted to a many-sided attack on the philosophy of optimism.

If God in His glory can embrace all creation at a glance, Candide, a mere mortal, was obliged to examine the world little by little, one country after another. He discovered that misfortune was not particular to him: it is universal. In Germany, for example, he found war and all its devastation; in Portugal there was an appalling earthquake, and the Inquisition which did violence to man's body and to his conscience; in the New World, the land of hope, Candide found that the sword and the cross, in active alliance, had filled a continent with violence, discord and intolerance. It was only in Eldorado that men were happy; but Eldorado is what this earth might be, not what it is. Thus, after exploring the known world, Candide concluded, unlike Leibnitz, that 'il y a horriblement de mal sur la terre' (ch.xxx). Good is far outweighed by evil.

Now, the harrowing misfortunes which Candide experienced were not imagined by Voltaire. They were drawn from recent history, a circumstance which gave irresistible force to Voltaire's argument against Leibnitz. In comparison, the philosophy of optimism appeared to be nothing more than a logical construction divorced from experience. Indeed, Voltaire's demonstration was so convincing that, with *Candide*, he discredited the philosophy of optimism in France.

One of the polemic devices employed by Voltaire is already implicit in this analysis: the constant effort to emphasize the distance that exists between the smiling theory of optimism and the harsh reality of the world. Voltaire's purpose in accumulating horror upon horror is to stress that the philosophy of optimism takes into account only a part of human experience, and is consequently untenable. To make his case even stronger, Voltaire employs a uniform perspective. Evil is always shown as unmitigated evil. Thus war is presented as vain slaughter, wanton destruction, an excellent opportunity for man's violent instincts to develop in their hallucinating plenitude. So as to preserve this uniformity of

vision, Voltaire chooses to ignore the courage of soldiers, their selfless devotion, their comradeship-in-arms.

Then there is Voltaire's fiendish delight in making an adversary appear ridiculous. In this case, his main victim is Pangloss, whose name means 'wordy' or 'verbose'. At the beginning of *Candide*, after describing the atmosphere of uncritical complacency that prevails in Baron Thunder-ten-Tronckh's castle, Voltaire goes on to make clear that, intellectually, Pangloss is in perfect harmony with his laughable surroundings: 'Il prouvait qu'il n'y a point d'effet sans cause, et que, dans ce meilleur des mondes possibles, le château de monseigneur le baron était le plus beau des châteaux, et madame la meilleure des baronnes possibles' (ch.i.). From the outset Pangloss is ridiculous, and his opinions unworthy of serious attention.

It is Pangloss who illustrates another polemic method frequently employed by Voltaire. This is the technique of demolishing an argument by reducing it to absurdity. To Pangloss, the optimist, all creation has its purpose, as he points out, gravely: 'Les cochons étant faits pour être mangés, nous mangeons du porc toute l'année' (ch.i.). Evil, too, is essential for it is thanks to evil, inflicted in a seemingly arbitrary manner, that mankind perceives and enjoys the abundance of good in the world. Pangloss hears of the misfortunes of others, and is himself afflicted with a vile disease. When he recovers, having suffered the loss of only one eye and one ear and the tip of his nose, he explains, unperturbed: 'Tout cela était indispensable, (. . .) et les malheurs particuliers font le bien général; de sorte que plus il y a de malheurs particuliers, et plus tout est bien' (ch.iv).

However, Voltaire's principal weapon is verbal irony, the trick of using words in such a way as to suggest something very different from their literal meaning. Sometimes the irony is immediately apparent, as in the description of Cunégonde's mother, a mountain of pomposity: 'Madame la baronne, qui pesait environ trois cent cinquante livres, s'attirait par là une très grande considération, et faisait les honneurs de la maison avec une dignité qui la rendait encore plus respectable' (ch.i). Frequently, however, Voltaire seeks to jolt his reader to an attitude of keen attention. This is clearly his intention in describing the battle at which Candide, the reluctant soldier, was present: 'Rien n'était si beau, si leste, si brillant, si bien ordonné que les deux armées. Les trompettes, les fifres, les hautbois, les tambours, les canons, formaient une harmonie telle qu'il n'en eut jamais en enfer' (ch.iii). This description appears serious until one sees the word 'harmonie' referring not only to musical instruments but also to the cannon. As the reader would have ex-

pected instead something like 'vacarme', the unusual combination of 'canons' and 'harmonie' makes him pause and seek out Voltaire's meaning. This is implicit in the rest of the sentence, 'une harmonie telle qu'il n'en eut jamais en enfer'. The 'harmonie' is different from anything known in hell; one would have expected it to be more pleasant; in fact, the contrary is the case.⁸

Voltaire's polemic in its various forms was not limited to an attack on optimism and different aspects of man-made evil. He examined, moreover, the idea that the course of events is guided by a beneficent divinity, or Providence. After hazardous travels and extraordinary adventures, Candide marries Cunégonde and settles on a farm in remote Turkey where they eke out a very meagre existence. Among those with him is Pangloss who, incorrigible, concludes, speaking to Candide:

Tous les événements sont enchaînés dans le meilleur des mondes possibles; car enfin, si vous n'aviez pas été chassé d'un beau château à grands coups de pied dans le derrière pour l'amour de mademoiselle Cunégonde, si vous n'aviez pas été mis à l'Inquisition, si vous n'aviez pas couru l'Amérique à pied, si vous n'aviez pas donné un bon coup d'épée au baron, si vous n'aviez pas perdu tous vos moutons du bon pays d'Eldorado, vous ne mangeriez pas ici des cédrats confits et des pistaches (ch.xxx).

By grouping together a number of obviously unrelated, incongruous events and presenting them, in comical fashion, as a divinely organized sequence, Voltaire makes clear his intention of ridiculing the notion of Providence. It is therefore small wonder that Candide rejects this interpretation of events as so many fine words, commenting briefly: 'Cela est bien dit.'

The fatalism which results from a thoroughly deterministic view of the universe is also submitted to scrutiny. As events are not guided by a beneficent spirit, it may well be asked whether they are conducted by someone like a supreme despot who is indifferent to man's lot, and unmoved by his distress. On the small farm in Turkey, Candide and his friends were becoming increasingly weary of arguing about creation. They finally decided to seek the advice of a wise man, the one who seemed best able to help them, 'un derviche très fameux qui passait pour le meilleur philosophe de la Turquie'.

When they visited him, Pangloss began by saying: 'Maître, nous venons vous prier de nous dire pourquoi un aussi étrange animal que l'homme a été formé.' The answer to this deferential enquiry was blunt: 'De quoi te mêles-tu?' dit le derviche; 'est-ce là ton affaire?' Candide, in protest, pointed out that man has good reason

to be interested in his lot: 'Mais, mon révérend père,' dit Candide, 'il y a horriblement de mal sur la terre.' His objection was swept aside: 'Qu'importe,' dit le derviche, 'qu'il y ait du mal ou du bien? Quand Sa Hautesse envoie un vaisseau en Egypte, s'embarrasse-t-elle si les souris qui sont dans le vaisseau sont à leur aise ou non?' There was evil; Candide and his companions had suffered bitterly from it in their flesh and in their hearts. Yet the wisest of men failed to offer them a satisfactory explanation of it. Was there a remedy for evil? Pangloss in dismay asked the dervish: 'Que faut-il donc faire?' The only answer he received was: 'Te taire', an abrupt injunction to accept misfortune with silent, uncomprehending resignation, because misfortune is the inevitable lot of mortal man. Fatalism leaves man without hope, and is rejected by Voltaire.

However, underlying the rejection of fatalism, providence and optimism, is Voltaire's attitude towards all forms of metaphysical belief. When the dervish failed to give his visitors the comfort they sought, Pangloss made no effort to hide his disappointment, and said reproachfully to him: 'Je me flattais (. . .) de raisonner un peu avec vous des effets et des causes, du meilleur des mondes possibles, de l'origine du mal, de la nature de l'âme et de l'harmonie préétablie.' The reply was eloquent: 'Le derviche, à ces mots, leur ferma la porte au nez' (ch.xxx). The dervish was not out of patience; he was simply without argument. By his curt gesture he acknowledged his inability to speak with certainty on metaphysical problems. The slammed door in *Candide* indicates the futility of metaphysical speculation.

While Candide and Pangloss were making their disconsolate way back to the farm, they stopped to talk to an old Turk, 'un bon vieillard qui prenait le frais à sa porte sous un berceau d'orangers'. Although they were strangers, the old Turk received them in a singularly hospitable manner. His home was unusual in that it was bathed in an atmosphere of peace and contentment. Candide was puzzled because the reason for this well-being escaped him. The old Turk could boast neither public office nor exalted rank. Furthermore, as he was without repute among the philosophers of Turkey, he obviously had not succeeded in solving the riddle of creation. Candide, in his simplicity, concluded therefore that the old Turk must possess great riches, the only other possible source of happiness: 'Vous devez avoir,' dit Candide au Turc, 'une vaste et magnifique terre'. 'Je n'ai que vingt arpents,' répondit le Turc; 'je les cultive avec mes enfants; le travail éloigne de nous trois grands maux: l'ennui, le vice et le besoin' (ch.xxx). Candide had come upon a man who through self-reliant endeavour had found contentment and enriched his life with purpose. In this way Candide

was led to realize that a happy life, far from being the privilege of exceptional beings, is within the grasp of ordinary mortals.

This discovery had the force of a revelation. Candide too had a farm, but he was idle, as were those who accompanied him. Only Cacambo led an active life, but he was overworked and therefore cursed his lot. The women, Cunégonde and *la Vieille*, were growing more and more discontented and irate. The men, disappointed in their hopes and thwarted by inactivity, led argumentative but aimless lives:

Et quand on ne disputait pas l'ennui était si excessif que la Vieille osa un jour leur dire: 'Je voudrais savoir lequel est pire, ou d'être violée cent fois par des pirates nègres, d'avoir une fesse coupée, de passer par les baguettes chez les Bulgares, d'être fouetté et pendu dans un auto-da-fé, d'être disséqué, de ramer en galère, d'éprouver enfin toutes les misères par lesquelles nous avons tous passé, ou bien de rester ici à ne rien faire?' 'C'est une grande question', dit Candide.

The answer to the problem differed from the possibilities suggested by *la Vieille*. It was given by the old Turk: activity is the remedy for man's distress. Voltaire thus takes a view which is radically different from the story of creation in the Old Testament. When man after the fall was driven from the garden of Eden, part of his punishment was to earn his bread by the sweat of his brow. Work was a curse laid on man by his angered creator. Voltaire sought to demonstrate the falseness of this attitude, and to show the value of endeavour. It should be added that contemporary circumstances gave this notion particular significance. In the middle of the eighteenth century the social élite of France was gathered in and around Paris. It formed a large leisured group devoted in great measure to frivolous occupations that afforded no lasting satisfaction.

Yet everyone has some particular ability, and is capable of simple but rewarding activity. Thus, on Candide's farm, when the old Turk's lesson has been learnt:

Chacun se mit à exercer ses talents (. . .). Cunégonde était à la vérité bien laide; mais elle devint une excellente pâtissière; Paquette broda; la Vieille eut soin du linge. Il n'y eut pas jusqu'à frère Giroflée qui ne rendît service; il fut un très bon menuisier, et même devint honnête homme (ch.xxx).

Moreover, activity is not simply desirable for individuals; it is an urgent necessity for mankind, as Candide insists in the words which bring this tale to an end: 'Il faut cultiver notre jardin.' It

may be that the Kingdom of God is not of this world, but *Candide's* garden is. Indeed, *Candide's* garden is nothing other than the earth that man inhabits.

'Il faut cultiver notre jardin' implies a certain measure of resignation, the acknowledgement of man's inability to solve the mysteries of life through speculation, and the need to accept as inevitable those natural misfortunes which men of the law, in their depravity, call acts of God. On the other hand, and this is what Voltaire emphasized, *Candide* found reason for hope and for continued courage. He had learnt that man is not fated to be the powerless victim of forces external to him, and had concluded that it was largely through man's neglect and folly that the world was the abode of suffering, a valley of tears. The need to remedy this situation was of paramount importance. *Candide* therefore ends with a call for resolute action which will enable man to avert the evil that can be averted, and lead him to comfort those who suffer from inevitable evil in its various manifestations.

To induce his readers to follow this course, Voltaire was not content simply to offer them the cheerless spectacle of man's misfortunes; he sought moreover to give them a glimpse of Eldorado, the ideal state. Here, man receives his due which is happiness. His conscience, his person and his goods are secure from violence. He leads an active life and has 'confort, goût, aisance, religion naturelle, bref l'idéal de la vie pour un homme libre, qui sait restreindre ses désirs à sa mesure et jouir en honnête homme'.⁹

Candide marks a date in Voltaire's life. Earlier, Voltaire too had been an optimist, not in the manner of Pangloss, but an optimist all the same. In 1736, in *Le Mondain*, he exclaimed:

Moi, je rends grâce à la nature sage,
Qui, pour mon bien, m'a fait naître en cet âge
Tant décrié par nos tristes frondeurs:
Ce temps profane est tout fait pour mes mœurs.¹⁰

Ten years later this enthusiasm had gone, and in *Zadig* (1747) the beneficence of 'la nature sage' was called into grave doubt.¹¹ Then, Voltaire's personal experiences, and his study of history in preparation for the *Essai sur les mœurs* (1756) merely confirmed his doubt. This development was precipitated by the Lisbon earthquake on 1 November 1755 when some 30,000 people lost their lives. Reflection on this catastrophe led him to reject the philosophy of optimism in his *Poème sur le désastre de Lisbonne* (1756), for he now clearly perceived that optimism is a sterile delusion. If man has the inestimable good fortune to live in the best of possible worlds, then it is useless to change anything in it—disease, crime, catastrophe,

all must be accepted with trusting submission. Optimism offers a static, despairing conception of life. Accordingly, Voltaire insisted: '*Tout est bien, pris dans un sens absolu et sans l'espérance d'un avenir, n'est qu'une insulte aux douleurs de notre vie*'.¹² *Candide*, on the other hand, presents a dynamic and hopeful view of man's lot. It reflects an important change in Voltaire's outlook, his adopting the resolute attitude of a meliorist. Moreover, the publication of *Candide* was soon followed by an important change in Voltaire's public life. He was not content simply to urge action on others; he redoubled his own efforts. It is indeed noteworthy that, as from 1759, when he was sixty-five years of age, his polemic took on unexpected force and amplitude. It was a generous campaign in favour of freedom, and he assailed oppression wherever he met it, whether it had been brought about by an intolerant church, cruel laws or corrupt, vindictive administrators. And, in a large measure, his campaign was successful. Yet evil still exists. The bicentenary of *Candide* is then a suitable moment to pause, and to ask whether this philosophical tale is in any way relevant to us today.

It is obvious enough that Leibnitz is no longer a living force, and that consequently the mighty attack on optimism, which bulks so large in *Candide*, does not correspond to contemporary preoccupations. Of a very different order is the attitude which leads Voltaire to make this attack. By far the greater part of the suffering portrayed in *Candide* is inflicted by man upon his fellows. Furthermore, Voltaire shows that man is neither the instrument of providence nor the victim of fate: fundamentally, man is responsible for man's lot. To be responsible but powerless would be abominable. Such however is not man's ultimate condition. Voltaire perceived that man is endowed so as to act and to attain well-being; he sought to arouse his contemporaries, to lead them to share his confidence in the fruitfulness of man's endeavour.

It is true that the problems which beset the world today are more grave than those which afflicted the eighteenth century: *Candide* (1959) would be more appalling than *Candide* (1759), and certainly much longer. If problems today are greater, man's resources are richer, and his knowledge more certain that passiveness merely aggravates his difficulties. Thus, it would be idle to contest the vitality and significance of *Candide*'s urgent injunction: '*Il faut cultiver notre jardin*'.

A Bicentenary: Voltaire's 'Candide'

NOTES AND REFERENCES

¹ See Theodore Besterman, *Some eighteenth century Voltaire editions . . .* in *Studies on Voltaire and the eighteenth century* (Geneva 1959), vol. viii, p.188.

² Letter from Thieriot, 23 février (1759), in *Voltaire's Correspondence* (Geneva 1958), vol. xxxv, p.136.

³ See Theodore Besterman, *op. cit.*, vol. viii, p.188.

⁴ See Hywel Berwyn Evans, *A provisional bibliography of English editions and translations of Voltaire in Studies on Voltaire. . .* (Geneva 1959), vol. viii, p.51.

⁵ There was no other course open to Voltaire, as events were to show. When *Candide* appeared, the Compagnie des pasteurs in Geneva declared it 'rempli de principes dangereux par rapport à la religion, et tendant à la dépravation des moeurs'; see the *commentary* for letter N° 7422 in *Voltaire's Correspondence* (Geneva 1958), vol. xxxv, p. 136. The *Parlement* of Paris was of the same opinion; see *ibid.*, letter N° 7426. The Compagnie des pasteurs and the *Parlement* of Paris then tried to stop the printing and selling of *Candide* in Geneva and Paris, respectively.

⁶ See Voltaire's letter to d'Argental, 12 août (1749) in *Voltaire's Correspondence* (Geneva 1956), vol. xvii, p.122.

⁷ See G. R. Havens, *The composition of Voltaire's 'Candide' in Modern Language Notes*, 1932, vol. xlvii, pp.225-234.

⁸ For a synthesis of the various studies devoted to Voltaire's irony, see William F. Bottiglia, *Voltaire's Candide: analysis of a classic* (Geneva 1959), pp.228-238.

⁹ See Raymond Naves, *De Candide à Saint-Preux* (Paris 1940), p.17.

¹⁰ For *Le Mondain*, see Voltaire, *Oeuvres complètes* (Paris 1877-1885), vol. x, p.83.

¹¹ See chapter xx (*L'ermite*), of *Zadig ou la Destinée* in Voltaire, *Oeuvres complètes* (Paris 1877-1885), vol. xxi, pp.86-91.

¹² See Voltaire's *Préface du Poème sur le désastre de Lisbonne* in his *Oeuvres complètes* (Paris 1877-1885), vol. ix, p.468.

LÉON CLADEL AND QUERCY

R. T. SUSSEX

University of Canterbury

QUERCY, the home of the Gallic tribe called the Cadurci, a domain which was united to the French Crown under Louis XI, is still a very rural, undeveloped part of France, not much encroached upon by modern industrial techniques. Geologically, it is linked with the vast limestone waste, the *Causses*, between Rodez and Meyrueis, ravined by the river Tarn, and its own *causses*, the *Petites Causses*, as they are called, are a rocky, rugged tract with few streams and sparse forest. Three or four rivers,—the Lot, the Tarn, the Aveyron and from the south the Garonne—traverse this province, but the towns are not large nor the population dense. From Montauban to Gourdon, from Figeac to Villeneuve-sur-Lot, Cahors is the only town of any importance, and the villages are few and far between. The *Quercinois* are still a pastoral, agricultural community, scarcely modified by the march of time.

This 'neglected spot' was the main theme of the novelist Léon Cladel, born in 1835 at Montauban. Many of his books and short stories occupy themselves, it is true, with Parisian types, chosen from the *petit peuple*: one of them, *Les martyrs ridicules*, even drew favourable comment from Baudelaire (in *Réflexions sur quelques-uns de mes contemporains*). Cladel's most successful books, however,—those most likely to attract the attention of posterity—are those devoted to his native Quercy, particularly the part he knew best, the Tarn valley between Montauban and Moissac, overlooked by the eminence at Lafrançaise. Even today this is an area of scattered farms and quite small villages: in the time-span of Cladel's work, reaching from the eighteen-seventies right back into the age of Louis XVI, this was far more so, and the primitive economy he describes, with human life reduced to its barest essentials and security confined to the well-to-do, reflects the author's conviction, constantly reiterated, that the Revolution of 1789, while profitable to the bourgeoisie, made almost no change in the lot of the French peasantry.

Cladel was throughout his life a rugged independent, whose prefaces alone, in book after book, reflect a truculent individualism and the mentality of a rebel—quite apart from the controversial values incarnate (and vocal!) in his main characters. He is not in the habit of mincing words: both in peasant idiom and in literary French he calls a spade a spade, with embellishments. His opinion

of the aristocracy, of the upper clergy, of the gendarmerie and judiciary is never in any doubt, and it is rarely, if ever, that he finds occasion to commend (except à propos of the Paris Commune of 1871) the domestic or external policies of his country. His philippic extends to the whole property-system on which French society is founded, with its marriage contracts, its laws of family inheritance and its intolerance of poverty, whether honest or otherwise. In his manner of dress, of speech and of conduct he affirmed himself, as his contemporaries testify, to be unashamedly a peasant. He therefore, quite logically, became the defender of the humble and poor.

This led him, inspired by Gambetta, to embrace the republican faith—and a faith it was, but not as the ‘opportunists’ of the eighteen-seventies conceived it. In Cladel, as in Eugène Le Roy, republicanism represents the selfless fervour of 1792, when barefooted French armies flung back the invader—represents the coarse, popular commonsense of Danton and his like—represents the defence of the little man, whether peasant or artisan, against the oppressor and those who sit in the seat of the scornful. Indeed, the First Republic becomes, to his fervent imagination, something akin to a golden age, when the humble and meek are exalted, and Europe, trailing heavily the burden of the dead centuries, falls in behind a re-awakened France. Such, too, was the inward conviction of Péguy, and, before him, of Michelet. Republicanism for Cladel is a faith with both a social and military content: socially it is embodied in men like his crossing-keeper, Kerkadec, and in his *Citoyenne Isidore*, both of them foes of compromise and contemptuous of renegades, while the military emphasis finds expression in *Achille et Patrocle*,¹ the tale of two inseparables of the Napoleonic wars, in *Revanche*² and *Yxglu*,³ stories of the last stand of the Communards in 1871, in *Griffe de fer*,⁴ a story of the Franco-Prussian war, and countless others. Obviously Cladel is impatient of any faith which is not prepared to resist injustice to the point of bloodshed and the supreme sacrifice. But it is also obvious that he has the Napoleonic fever in his veins: he yearns for the bygone days when France could impose her will upon Europe by force of arms, and book after book finds its action interrupted while the author inserts long pages of reminiscence by veterans of the Italian, Spanish or Russian campaigns. This military *idée fixe* is not always associated with the principle of the Declaration of the Rights of Men: Cladel is a Frenchman, with a doctrinaire Frenchman’s intolerance of aliens, particularly Germans, and nationalism of an extreme type stems naturally, as history has shown, from the French Revolution. History, however, has also shown that

social and economic reform does not commonly issue from the gentle persuasions of reason. Hence Cladel's militancy.

It is probable, too, that this love of *panache* and violence springs from an inherent romanticism in the author. He claims literary descent from Baudelaire,⁵ and did, as a young man, pay homage to the poetic ideals of the *Parnasse*; but it is a far cry from that to the torrential rhetoric in which he constantly indulges—the sort of thing captured by Rude in stone on the Arc de Triomphe low-reliefs. It is surely indicative of some afterglow of romanticism that the idiom of the eighteen-thirties, with melodramatic effects, an enormous abuse of enumeration and inversion, and a rather quaint, often laughable, preference for unusual or archaic words, should persist well into the period of Zola and Anatole France. It makes Cladel an apostle rather of the later Hugo than of Baudelaire, and shows that this scion of Quercy stock, even if he chose to set up house in Sèvres, preferred to trust his own insights, and not to learn from the critical attacks that are inevitably consequent upon publication. He was resolved not to be moulded into any Paris pattern,—but his resolve was unfortunate. Undisciplined writing like his often compromises by its very excess and by its impenitent craving for polysyllables the very effects it is striving to create. There are some specially bad examples of this in *Titi Foyssac IV*. And Cladel's mania for stringing off long series of exotic-sounding proper names often borders on the ludicrous. The total effect is so uneven that, quite obviously, much of it will be deservedly consigned to oblivion.

Another element in Cladel which bears clearly the mark of his age is his anticlericalism. This was doubtless a corollary of his republican faith, and justified by the traditional alliance of Throne and Altar. His references to the Deity are, in the mouths of commoners, generally not unduly reverent: *le grand lama*, *le barbu d'en haut*, *le grand rentier du ciel*, *Père*, *Fils et Cie* are not terms normally found on a believer's lips. And it is only the poorer churchmen, the village priests, who win his sympathy: the prelates are usually reactionaries and utterly uncharitable, while here and there a lecherous wine-bibber of a priest provides a pretext for discrediting organized religion and *Calotins* in general. Both Catholics and Protestants are scarified in *Titi Foyssac IV*, where a Christian philanthropist, ostracized by either sect, is best understood by an atheist medico and a refugee Jew. Cladel's own faith would appear to derive mainly from the Gospels, without Pauline or later accretions—(Barbey d'Aurevilly styled him 'a Catholic without knowing it')—but his values are ethical rather than religious.

It should not be assumed from all this that Cladel's regionalism

is only a marginal interest: it is basic to all his life and work. The life history of his own father, told in *Montauban-Tu-ne-le-sauras-pas*,⁶ bespeaks a passionate attachment to his native Quercy, and an unswerving resolve, in a man condemned to a migratory life, one day to return to till his own plot of land in a landscape that his fathers had known and loved. *Les Auryentys*,⁷ the simple story of three brothers, is just as eloquent: these three, the peasant, the priest and the soldier, reunited in the home farm after prolonged absence, refuse to let the property be parcelled out by the laws of inheritance and experience the joy of ploughing together the beloved soil that had nourished their childhood, among the coombs and plateaux of their own province. It is patently an echo of Lamartine's ploughmen in *Jocelyn*, but simple and human this time.

Simplicity, however, was by no means Cladel's characteristic manner: his constant leaning was towards melodrama and morbid horror. His *N'a-qu'un-oeil* (1882) is evidence of that; this story of pre-revolutionary France is one long chronicle of torture, rape and incest, with peasants disfigured, crucified, quartered or burnt to death at the behest of feudal tyrants, while the story is vitiated throughout by pompous and insufferable rhetoric. Cladel's grandiose hero, aged, hideous and taciturn, might be more convincing if the author were not so over-exploiting, on the one hand, physical horror, and on the other the downfall of feudalism and the republican *mystique* of 1792. Yet even in this book the Quercy landscape is affectionately and movingly described.

There is a similar note struck, though attenuated by a George Sand manner, in *Celui de la Croix-aux bœufs* (1878), where a gargantuan peasant feast, followed by a spate of local songs and a drinking bout, is described in full, naturalistic detail, and where the narrative is arbitrarily interrupted by the author's recollection (again in full detail) of the public execution of a countryman who had fed his swine with the flesh of his unfaithful wife and her lover. Apart from these gems, the story is rather in the rustic tradition of George Sand's *François le champi*—especially the idyllic superlatives with which the heroine is described and the lyrical, pastoral diction she uses on her lover: after various purple passages virtue triumphs, and *tout finit par des chansons*. This book is full of details of peasant-usage, but it over-exploits folklore and folk-song, its strength is undisciplined, its delineation of character lacks *nuance*, and it is grossly over-written.

This rhetorical element consorts oddly with Cladel's naturalistic vision of the peasant. His *Enterrement d'un ilote*,⁸ for example, is a trenchant condemnation of peasant avarice, and the preface to *La fête votive* (1872), 'Réponse de l'auteur à M. Louis Veuillot',

shows that Cladel nourishes no illusions about the 'bête serve' he is describing. Cladel knows, from his experience as a lawyer's clerk, that the peasant's one religion is profit, that the soil is his master, and that he cares little for education or civic tradition. Thus far, at least, he keeps company with Balzac, and spurns the 'comic opera peasants' of Chateaubriand. His Quercy peasant, that 'animal des anciens jours', is miserly and superstitious, inured to servitude; but Cladel is confident that education will transform him and make him an intelligent, responsible citizen. This novel, *La fête votive*, sets in evidence these two conflicting factors: the peasants do respond to the voice of reason and of reconciliation, but the book is chiefly a rather Breughel-esque evocation of an epic fight between the men-folk of two rival villages in Quercy. The fair itself serves as a pretext for introducing peasant conversations, the sale of pictures and of love potions by itinerant vendors, and immoderate potation at the local hostelry, but it is the fight itself, enhanced by a stampede of cattle and swine, which is the chief matter of the story, and which is described with characteristic masculine relish. Yet the little incidental touches—local superstition, terms from *patois*, village music, the art of healing as locally understood—render the picture authentic as well as vivid. It all makes an odd mixture. As Baudelaire had observed, 'M. Cladel insiste avec fureur', and his art is 'minutieux et brutal, turbulent et enfiévré'.⁹ For Baudelaire this fell short of genuine art.

It is, then, chiefly in *Le bouscassié* (1869) that Cladel shows his real quality as a regionalist. This story, again a love-idyll of the *François le champi* type, with sundry trials for the lovers but a happy ending, gains strength from its simplicity of narration and characterization: Cladel's rhetoric obtrudes itself much less, and though there is tragedy, the author refrains from labouring the obvious and from his habitual naturalism of detail. Documentation in folklore is adequate but not excessive: the little details of the woodsman's craft, of wheat harvesting, of the vintage season, of peasant dances beside the Tarn, of the quaint ox-drawn ferry between Moissac and Montauban are the tribute of an eye-witness, and of one who 'belongs'. So, too, Cladel is admirable at rendering the sun-drenched quiet of a farmyard or presbytery, the din and animation of a village market, the hospitable warmth of a peasant's home, the Gothic twilight of the oak-woods, or the spells and charlatantry of a rural soothsayer. His landscapes are painted with a proprietorial pride and even awe: latticed with its ribbon of roads, ribbed with rock, furrowed by time into a confusion of hillocks and ravines, Cladel's beloved countryside is, more than a nurse, a mother to a rugged but kindly breed of men. Her sea-

sonal changes govern all their life and activity: her storms and floods try out their fortitude, while her bounty rewards their toil with fruitfulness. In the foundling woodsman who is the hero of the story, the sense of attachment to this ancient soil begets a sort of physical kinship not unnatural in a motherless bairn; even the 'green-robed senators' that surround his hut are friends, a genuine presence,¹⁰ and the mere thought of being wrenched away from this dear corner of France is a presage of death for him. Suckled by a beast, nurtured by the woods, with scarcely any human ministrants to shape his childhood, he has his native *pays* knit into every fibre of him: in costume, speech, conduct, he is its living image. Such data amply fulfil the requirements of a regional novel.

Cladel's work, then, for all its unevenness and excess, is well worthy of mention in a tentative chronicle of the regional novel, though histories of literature, in this or in later ages, may be content to dismiss him with a contemptuous sentence or two.¹¹ At a time when this category of literature was as yet ill-defined, he brought to it a generous enthusiasm and a passionate devotion to his native province. To such, much may be forgiven.

NOTES

¹ *Les Va-nu-pieds*.

² *ibid.*

³ *Urbains et ruraux*.

⁴ *ibid.*

⁵ *N'a-qu'un-œil*, XLII.

⁶ *Les Va-nu-pieds* (1873).

⁷ *ibid.*

⁸ *ibid.*

⁹ Baudelaire—Oeuvres, vol. II, Pléiade, pp. 569, 570—*Les Martyrs ridicules*.

¹⁰ As also with Chateaubriant's *Monsieur des Lourdines*, in Poitou.

¹¹ v. Lalou—*Histoire de la littérature française contemporaine*, pp. 37 and 108.

WHAT IS FASTNACHTSPIEL?

D. M. VAN ABBÉ

University of Adelaide

THE sources of our knowledge of the early German *Fastnachtspiel* (Shrovetide comedy) are not plentiful. There is only one good collection of these early plays; this is Adalbert von Keller's *Fastnachtspiele aus dem 15. Jahrhundert*. It contains 132 plays and fragments, put together as an early contribution to the *Bibliothek des literarischen Vereins in Stuttgart*, of which Keller was the indefatigable editor and secretary. Between the late 1840's and 1853, the date of the publication of his first volume, Keller assembled a mass of material; his first collection formed volumes 28-30 of the *Bibliothek*. The editor felt weaknesses in his work, went over the ground again and produced a fourth volume which shows much greater caution in treatment of source MSS; this is volume 46 of the *Bibliothek* and appeared five years later in 1858.

Since then only one major work has treated Keller at length. This was the Strassburg philologist Michels' *Studien über die ältesten deutschen Fastnachtspiele*, which did not appear until 1896. Michels was largely interested in language, but as soon as he took up the Keller collection he was forced to try to bring some order into its confusion. Nürnberg antiquarians, notably Hampe and Lier,¹ also used Keller and tried to find some key to the labyrinth of his confusion.

Keller's editorial method was haphazard. He printed the plays in the order he found them. His numbers 1-64 rest on Wolfenbüttel MS, 18. 12 Aug.; numbers 65-104 on Munich MS, cg 715. The remaining 28 include plays written later than the 15th century, e.g. Gengenbach's *X Alter*. Some of the factual errors in the first volumes Keller corrected in his Supplement, but the order of the collection remained undisturbed. There is still plenty of room (as Zingerle² found in Sterzing) for research in obscure libraries and in the obscurer parts of well-known libraries.

Keller's collection is confusing in its editor's lack of interest in chronology. But it also lacks any attempt to order the plays by themes. Early drama is incomprehensible without some understanding of early history: this calls for some anthropology as well as the kind of information offered in Chapters VI and XII-XIV of Chambers' *The Mediaeval Stage*.³ Almost the only respectably academic effort in this direction as regards the *Fastnachtspiel* has been the American Rudwin's *Origins of the German Carnival Comedy*,⁴ a very slight offering.

What is Fastnachtspiel?

It was perhaps inevitable though unfortunate that the genre should have attracted the Nazis. Robert Stumpfl's excellent analysis of the anthropological history, *Kultspiele der Germanen als Ursprung des mittelalterlichen Dramas*, 1936, is seriously marred by his racist theories. Hostility to religion led Stumpfl to deny the Church any priority in introducing the drama to Europe. This practically disqualified him as a serious scholar; but his theories do throw light on the origins of the *Fastnachtspiel*, which do probably lie where Stumpfl said they did, and certainly not in the same place as those of the liturgical drama.⁵

Chambers too (as against Creizenach⁶) had suspected links between 'popular' drama and folklore. It must be assumed today that the *Fastnachtspiel* at least grew out of popular festival customs. Though the more pagan of these customs were ultimately banished by the Church, many have survived to this day in surreptitious ways: folk-dance, children's games and rhymes, Carnival customs. There is also every likelihood that the Germans, who were still at the time of the Reformation, as Naogeorgus pointed out,⁷ keeping up pagan customs, developed their Shrovetide playlets out of such rituals.

It is here that Keller's disorderly arrangement of his texts is so unhelpful. To bring order into the themes of the Shrovetide playwrights is difficult; nonetheless favourite themes are obvious from the start. Michels drew attention to the fondness for 'revues', processional playlets in which a number of characters come forward in turn and say a part or 'Spruch'. There is no dramatic cut-and thrust in such 'revues'; the players came before the spectators in procession, stood around the playing-area (a stage is unlikely at the outset), and joined together in a dance at the end. From the 'revue' certain favourite offshoots developed: sometimes the chain of characters symbolised groups of characteristics (forms of lechery, idleness, ill-starred wooing); less often it introduced social types.

Stumpfl interested himself above all in one large group, those depicting court-scenes. These dramatised courts of law range in treatment from well-drawn realism to crude caricature. A favourite practice in these plays was to show the *Schöffen* (jurors) giving their opinions: in some plays, however, the legal proceedings are almost nugatory whilst a string of such 'opinions' follows one after the other with the regularity of the set speeches in the 'revues'.

A fairly large group of the plays treats themes excerpted from the liturgical dramas, especially themes which must be linked, even if one does not agree with Stumpfl, with the *mercator*-scenes in the liturgical drama. The mercator is here, however, freed from

his necessity to sell unguents to the Maries, and has varied escapades with his boy and his wife. In other plays the devils from the liturgical drama spread themselves in comedy situations; the most disturbing of this group are those in which the devils are opposed by 'böse alte Weiber'. Whatever the ritual background of these latter (witches, etc.), in the *Fastnachtspiele* they are normally teamed with the devils to form a vaudeville slapstick 'act'.⁸

Chambers was most impressed by the links between the earliest 'popular' plays and mimetic parts of the folk-dance. Creizenach explained many elements of the *Fastnachtspiel* from the same source. It is, however, curious that the few plays in Keller which are called 'dances' (especially No. 14, *Morischgentanz*, which it is tempting to associate with the Morris-dance) approximate more closely to 'revues' than to known dance-figures.⁹ We are in fact enshrouded in near-darkness as soon as we investigate the *anti-quity* of those texts we actually possess.

It is obvious that the majority of them *is* corrupt. The MSS Keller used are made up of disparate 'collections' formed in the 15th century or later; it is only a fortunate chance which allowed Michels to prove that at least parts were *deliberately* assembled by 15th-century collectors. There will not have been texts at the beginning. The earliest crude plays were improvised as the players went along: Oscar Eberle gives many examples of such crude drama amongst primitive peoples.¹⁰ Later the texts will have been written down and passed on from one set of players to the next. The fate of the biblical dramas of the 16th century shows that each hand-over led to re-working of the text. Michels found many examples in Keller where a play with references pointing to Tyrol or the Rhineland was made over into a play with Nürnberg references. In many cases the language of the original was only slightly adapted for easier performance by speakers of Nürnberg dialect.

Perhaps the most interesting of all questions is the relationship of the genre to the *Freie Reichsstadt* Nürnberg. Nürnberg was the wealthiest and most independent of late mediaeval German city-republics and we might well expect to find an indigenous literature developing there if anywhere.¹¹ The dialect of Keller's texts is clearly for the most part Nürnberg; linguistic evidence allots only a minority of texts to Switzerland, the Rhineland, Upper Bavaria and Tyrol. But at least two of Keller's texts came from a Low German source, and some interesting evidence on performance of *Fastnachtspiele* in Lübeck (but not the texts) has been uncovered.¹² The Brenner centre of Sterzing also produced

What is Fastnachtspiel?

a sizeable number of variant texts. No other sources, however, provide as many as Nürnberg.

It may be argued that the wealthy city-republic of Nürnberg was the only late-mediaeval German city with a burgher class sufficiently well developed to produce an art form of its own.¹³ The development of German Literature was slowed by the division of Germany into numerous impotent centres, ranging from mighty duchies to tiny knightly and ecclesiastical jurisdictions. Within this framework no self-conscious middle class could possibly grow as grew in England from the 15th century. It was indeed only from under the aegis of the *Landesfürsten* that any independent middle-class literature developed as late as the 17th century.

What takes the place of the English self-reliant, middle-class men of letters in Germany before the 17th century was a rootless class of 'intelligentsia'. It may be misleading to say with Professor Pascal¹⁴ that Luther's values are 'lower middle-class' values, but this does tell one something about the intellectual *level* of the middle strata of German social life and makes good sense if one thinks of 'lower middle classes' not as meaning a broken-down *upper* middle-class, but as designating a rather superficially educated—but rising—artisan class not very far removed from the peasantry, such as made up, in fact, the body of guildsmen in the 16th-century German city.¹⁵

It would seem, on the evidence of the *Fastnachtspiele*, as though the social composition of the Nürnberg population had been of precisely this kind for the greater part of the 15th century. The few biographical details known about earlier Nürnberg *Fastnachtspiel*-writers such as Hans Rosenplüt and Hans Folz confirm the picture in the last paragraph.¹⁶ The same relations obtained in the other major city-states: Folz was probably a native of Worms (Mainz, next door to Worms, is the home of the Mastersinger 'school', an essentially 'lower middle-class' institution); Pamphilus Gengenbach, the Basle writer of religious *Fastnachtspiele* during the first decades of the 16th century, may have gone to Basle from Nürnberg.¹⁷

The *Fastnachtspiel*, though cultivated with particular intensity in Nürnberg, was, however, certainly not restricted to that city. There are references in the plays to other Franconian cities (notably Bamberg and Würzburg), to Augsburg, and to certain Upper Bavarian centres. A few of the plays stem from Switzerland—a highly developed corner of the mediaeval economic scene and an area where, during the early Reformation period, the genre took on new life as a vehicle for religious polemic and propaganda.¹⁸

Much is now known about the Tyrol; there the genre was widely cultivated by the peasant population¹⁹—even though the Sterzing collection is connected with a humanist figure, the painter and official Vigil Raber, who may well have re-written those versions we now possess.

There is also evidence of cultivation of the genre in wealthy cities of the northern seaboard. From Lübeck comes a list, running through many decades of the 15th century, of the titles performed by a guild of merchant-patricians, the *Zirkelbrüder*. So many of these titles point to subjects known from Nürnberg and the Mainz Mastersinger-‘school’ that we may reasonably assume that the plays were, in fact, Lübeck versions of common Mastersinger themes. There are other indications of performances in the North. The strangest link is Burkard Waldis’ 1527 *Fastnachtspiel* on the Prodigal Son. This is a link between ‘popular’ plays and the humanist Reformers: it was called a ‘Fastnachtspiel’ but strove in its form to apply lessons learnt from classical drama. Waldis’ prologue gives no clear indication that this kind of play was widely performed in Riga (where his play was written and actually produced), but attacks ‘heathen’ dramatic performances in general (which could mean Passion-plays) and, in particular, a *commedia dell’arte* play he saw during his visit to Rome.

The popularity of the *Fastnachtspiel* all over Germany is, therefore, attested. The general outline of the plays is also everywhere similar. Everywhere they are short (500-1000 lines) plays on a traditional theme—and this might be chosen only within certain very well-known bounds. Everywhere too they had the tendency to be outspoken and frequently they were obscene.

Despite Stumpfl no one has exhausted the study of *ritual* affiliations. Some prefer to see these links as traditional and stress the purely *aesthetic* aims of later writers (even before Sachs, who had, of course, *no* ritual knowledge or interest). Parts of the *Fastnacht* version of the Solomon and Marcolf legend make no sense at all from the purely literary or dramatic viewpoint: this is a collection of cultic remnants harnessed to a well-known theme. Though Gusinde gave a thoughtful interpretation of the genesis of the two *Neidhart* plays, some of the ritual elements introduced (Neidhart cuts the peasants’ limbs off!) have a most pagan flavour.²⁰ Nor are all the ritual survivals in recognisably ‘early’ plays: *Münch Berchtholt*, for example, takes its plot from an Italian *novella* but is tricked out with bizarre arabesques clearly added for decoration by a playwright no longer aware of their ritual significance. This is also true of the dozen plays on motifs from courtly or ‘popular’ epic; epic and ritual plot-elements are clums-

ily combined. We should, however, note the conservatism with which professional stage-‘business’ is preserved from generation to generation (as with the modern clown). Here ritual is preserved but it is completely fossilized.

A famous play from Switzerland (*Des Entkrist Vsp.*) and one which was probably by Folz (*Des Türken Vsp.*) offer examples of yet another facet of the Shrovetide comedies. In these two the ‘occasional’ versifier who wrote them wished to use the annual feast of satire to make a local political point. And thus we may come on to the road to understanding how they composed, for these methods turn out to be the method Sachs used in the following century. The playwright searched the storehouse of traditional lore until he found a subject not recently treated; he might even be offered a script brought back from abroad. This he integrated into a play filled with local allusions and jokes; his play touched indeed on anything which the author knew would be in the minds of the audience, as the players took their play round from inn to inn and from private benefactor to private benefactor. The way in which the ageing Sachs suddenly seized on the Eulenspiegel legends to fill out his failing store of new material is revealing.²¹

From the formal point of view there is an untrammelled chain of development—from the straight-out “revue” to the revue in which the characters are interrogated by one central character, and from there to more developed plays in which there was almost that clash of wills which marks modern drama but which as Stammer said, should *not* be expected of late mediaeval plays.²²

Does the genre parody the peasant? Not really, as Martini showed.²³ The 15th-century townsman was only just a stage removed from the peasant and might be allowed a slight dig at his country cousin. These themes are more archetypal than mere *social* satire. The basic themes are eternal: the triumph of the quick-witted over the gullible, marriage discontents, general clash of human temperaments.²⁴ Though the *Fastnachtspiel*, no matter what the subject, was also always performed in *peasant costume*, this was a professionals’ tradition like the Italian Carnival garb of the Manchester pantomime troupe today.²⁵ Nor is coarseness a guide to peasant origin: the popular literature of the 15th century is filled with the coarseness of an urban ‘lower middle class’ which ran riot because it was inadequately balanced and corrected in the public market of literature by productions of humanists and mystics who *did* write in the vernacular.

It is interesting to observe in the Keller texts the way in which social classes are treated. The writers lean towards urban feeling:

knights are seldom mentioned without being satirised—there are some texts which picture knights, called on for service by King or Emperor, giving ‘bourgeois’ excuses for not performing their duty. The plays in which they are least criticised are those few in which a ‘revue’ of social classes brings forward all the estates, to score points off them all. This was the usual connection in which the Burgher made his few appearances: of the middle-class professions, in fact, the only representatives were the Doctor and the Lawyer. The former bore a strong family likeness to the Passion-play *mercator* and seems sometimes to be there merely because medical robes were (and are) striking costumes for dressing up. The lawyer was necessary for the court-scenes but was scarcely criticised outside his *functional* appearances. Where he was satirised it was in those plays suspected of having been written by lawyers. It is indeed likely that a good many texts were the work of the rootless ‘intellectuals’: one of the ‘revues’ criticises all the social classes, contrasting them unfavourably with the life of the *Schreiber*.²⁶

There is some satire of the Cleric but it is surprisingly mild when the anti-clerical role of most 16th-century dramatic literature is considered. It was here, indeed, that Sachs learned how to *avoid* polemic, a position in which he differed from his humanist contemporaries. The *Fastnachtspiel* was only hard on the Cleric in a few (largely later) texts, in which the attitude of the *novella* was taken over. In these there developed the tradition of the ‘geiler Mönch’, some of whose descendants may be seen in Sachs (e.g. *Der fahrende Schüler mit dem Teufelsbannen*). But this is not anti-clericalism: the satire was less important than the simple slapstick.

The few largely political plays were written by Rosenplüt, Folz and some Swiss poets. The talent required to take this step out of the usual rut was beyond the ability of any but the *best* poets—and those living in the *most developed areas*. This may be negative explanation too for the fact that the five plays in which anti-Semitism is a central theme all point to Nürnberg (where the Jews came into economic conflict with the City Council at the end of the 15th century) and Switzerland (Swiss merchants too were rivals of the Jews). It is likely that at least three of these plays are by Folz.

What was the dramatic effectiveness of the genre? This is difficult to say. Perhaps three dozen of Keller’s plays are complete (though simple) and dramatically valid; another dozen are complete but so short that they may be merely inadequately preserved producer’s outlines (a stage better than the *Frankfurter*

What is Fastnachtspiel?

Dirigierrolle). Finally there are some two dozen which might be capable of effective performance today.²⁷ But the criteria used to judge these might have nothing to do with the standards applied 500 years ago. The most that can be said is that these last plays promise to develop into the better kind of Hans Sachs play. And even here there are unanswered questions:

Was the play about Aristotle and the Persian Queen who tricked him into carrying her on his back a humanist product or was it a mediaeval legend used as a veneer for some half-forgotten folklore ceremony? Was it a humanist who 'translated' *Maître Pathelin* in Lucerne as *Der Kluge Knecht*? Was it humanists or goliards who adapted the four successful plays taken from the Arthur and Dietrich von Bern cycles? Was the cleric Schernberg, who is credited with the authorship of the Faust-like *Frow Jutte* in the 1480's, the first to treat this plot?²⁸ If not, how does the theme stand in relation to the *Theophilus* legend?

NOTES

¹ T. Hampe, *Die Entstehung des Theaterwesens in Nürnberg*. Nürnberg 1898.

L. Lier, *Studien zur Geschichte des Nürnberger Fastnachtspiels*. Mitt.d.Ver.-f.Gesch.d.St.N., IX 1897-.

² O. Zingerle, *Die Sterzinger Spiele nach Aufzeichnungen des Vigil Raber*. Wiener Neudrucke 9, 11. Wien 1886.

³ 2 vols. Oxford 1903.

⁴ New York 1920.

⁵ See Pascal's criticism of Stumpfl in *M.L.R.* 35, 1941.

⁶ *Geschichte des neueren Dramas*. 2nd ed. Halle 1911.

Also K. Holl, *Geschichte des deutschen Lustspiels*. Leipzig 1923.

⁷ *Regnum papisticum*, 1533.

⁸ M. J. Rudwin, *Der Teufel in den deutschen geistlichen Spielen des Mittelalters und der Reformationszeit*. Göttingen 1915. F. Brietzmann, *Die böse Frau in der deutschen Literatur des Mittelalters*. Palästra 42, Berlin 1912.

⁹ The first suggestion was advanced by K. Müllenhoff, *Über den Schwerttanz in Festgaben für Heymer*, Berlin 1871. This was a fertile hunting-ground for Nazi theorists, hence caution is needed when using otherwise valuable works such as: W. Hansen, *Volkstanz und Spiel in Deutsche Volksskunde*, Leipzig 1934, Vol. I, p. 342 ff; and R. Wolfram, *Schwerttanz und Männerbund*, Kassel 1936—Mr Angus Wilson is all too acute! See too C. P. Baskervill, *Dramatic aspects of mediaeval folk-festivals in England*. *Studies in Philology* 17, N. Carolina 1920.

¹⁰ O. Eberle, *Cenalora; Leben, Glaube, Tanz und Theater der Urvölker*. Olten 1954.

¹¹ The relationship to the Nürnberg *Schembartlaufen* is discussed in all the standard works. The most illuminating remarks are in Stumpfl, and in M. Herrmann, *Forschungen zur deutschen Theatergeschichte*. Berlin 1914.

¹² W. Seelmann, *Mittelniederdeutsche Fastnachtspiele*. Drucke d. Ver. f. ndt. Sprachforschung I. 1885. Other articles in this issue too.

¹³ A penetrating study of burgher mentality in the late 15th century is: H. Baron, *Religion and politics in the German imperial cities* in *Eng. Hist. Rev.* 52, 1937, pp. 405 614 ff.

¹⁴ R. Pascal, *Luther and the social basis of the German Reformation*. London 1933. Prof. Pascal agrees that his formulations require modification in the light of more recent work, e.g. G. Rupp, *The Righteousness of God: Luther Studies*. London 1953, where there is (p. 287) some criticism of this view of Pascal's.

¹⁵ For Sachs' biography see: R. Genée 1894 (2nd ed. 1902); A. Stiefel 1894; C. Schweitzer 1897; H. Cattañes 1923; W. French 1925; H. Oppel in *Dichtung und Volkstum*, 1938.

¹⁶ The only modern notices of either writer in *Verfasser-Lexikon des Mittelalters*. Berlin 1923. See otherwise Michels, *op. cit.*

¹⁷ The sole Gengemach edition is that by K. Goedeke, Hannover 1856. See my *Development of dramatic form in Gengebach*, *M.L.R.*, XLV, 1, 1950.

¹⁸ See O. Eberle, *Theatergeschichte der Innerschweiz*. Königsberg 1929. Also my *Change and tradition in the work of Niclaus Manuel*, *M.L.R.*, XLVII, 2, 1952.

¹⁹ See e.g. W. Brecht, *Die Vorläufer von Hofmannsthals Jedermann in Österreich*, *Rundschau*, 20. Jg., 1924. Also L. Schmidt, *Das deutsche Volksschauspiel*. Berlin 1954.

²⁰ K. Gusinde, *Neidhart mit dem Veilchen*. Breslau 1899

²¹ F. Brie, *Eulenspiegel und H. Sachs in Festschrift d. German. Ver.* Breslau. Leipzig 1902, pp. 204 ff.

²² *Real-Lexikon* I, p. 219.

²³ F. Martini, *Das Bauerntum im deutschen Schrifttum bis zum 16. Jahrhundert*. Halle 1944.

²⁴ A useful comparative study is O. E. Winslow, *Low comedy as a structural element in English drama*. Chicago 1926.

²⁵ Notes on stage-conditions in Herrmann and in Stumpfl's many useful editions and contributions (e.g. to *Zs. f. d. Ph.* 54-5.)

²⁶ On the possible role of the goliards see E. Reich, *Der Mimus*, Berlin 1903, an exhaustive work which throws many interesting lights on this comparatively unknown stratum of the population.

²⁷ The Keller numbers which I consider valid are: 3 (marriage-quarrel with interfering in-laws); 7 (Michels calls this the best play in the 'Hochzeit-machen' tradition); 17 (Aristotle in comic situations); 19 (*Novella* plot: clever maid saves mistress's virtue); 20 (parts of this, *Der Herzog von Burgund*, an anti-Semitic play); 21 ('kleines Neidhartspiel'); 37 (cleric and bawd); 46 (the peasant who would not tell a lie); 53 ('groses Neidhartspiel', though not all episodes are dramatic); 56 (this is the best of the devil-old-woman fights); 57 (the best of the marriage-quarrels); 62 (short extract from the Dietrich legend); 81 (competition to find the most virtuous woman at King Arthur's court); 107 (*Der Kluge Knecht*); 111 (*Elsslin Tragdenknaben*); there is a version by Manuel at the end of the 20's but this is said to date from the beginning of the century—I am dubious); 111 (*Frow Jutte*—a version of the 'Pope John' legend); 114 (a collective *Taming of the Shrew*); 123 (*Contz Zwerg*; probably 16th-c.); 126 (*St Jörg*; dull in parts; could also be 16th-c.); 127 (like 81); 128 (Aristotle and the Persian Queen; corrupt but still effective).

²⁸ The literature on *Frow Jutte* throws little light on the most obscure points. It may be found listed in the *Verf.-Lex.* under 'Schernberk'.

OSWALD VON WOLKENSTEIN AND 'MINNESANGS HERBST'

A. N. BROOKS

University of Canterbury

IN his foreword to the *Minnesangs Wende*¹ Hugo Kuhn expresses concern that the immediate post-Classical Minnesang and literature of the German Middle Ages should have been so sadly neglected: 'Die späthöfische Literatur des 13. Jahrhunderts bedarf seit langem statt geistreicher Aperçus einer neuen Untersuchung ihrer Grundlagen mit den inzwischen vermehrten Forschungsmitteln.'² An even stronger plea may be made for the 14th and 15th centuries which are, from the point of view of literary research, the most neglected period in German Literature. A striking example of one poet of this so-called 'Epigonenperiode' who has received but scant justice in these 'geistreiche Aperçus' is Oswald von Wolkenstein. Ehrismann describes his works as 'hervorragend . . . unter den Dichtern der gesunkenen Zeit'.³ Boesch sees him as 'der begabteste Liederdichter der Spätzeit . . . Auffällig [bei ihm] ist die spontane Ichbezogenheit.'⁴ But in spite of the praise given him in various histories of literature, Oswald has experienced the fate of most of the poets of his age: his life and works have not, in general, been considered worthy of research and little is generally known about him.

Facts about Oswald and his life may be gleaned in abundance from the poet's own Lyrics; from these and other records which have been preserved a fairly full picture may be gained of him.⁵ He was born in South Tyrol in 1377 and at the age of ten appears to have run away from home, returning upon the death of his father, probably about 1400. His status was that of 'Freiherr, mit reichsritterlichen Ansprüchen' (*Verfasserlexikon*): he thus belonged to the society of the Court, and in the service of the Court made further trips abroad. Ehrismann suggests: 'eine solche geographische Kenntniss hat seinem Leben und seiner Sprache einen besonderen Stempel aufgedrückt und seiner Welt einen weiteren Horizont gegeben';⁵ but Neumann, writing for the sober *Verfasserlexikon*, warns: 'Man hüte sich, das Abenteuerwesen des Jugendlichen nur nach den vereinfachenden Worten der Lyrik zu urteilen.' Certainly Oswald makes use of *Fremdwörter* of all descriptions in his lyrics, even writing one "love poem", as a boastfully humorous display of linguistic virtuosity, in no less than six languages—but he is essentially a player with words, or, indeed, with mere sounds. His travels

themselves would appear to have exerted but a secondary and minor influence on the greater part of his work. From about 1402, or shortly after he re-appeared on the home estate, he expresses a passionate love for a certain Sabine Jäger, heiress to the neighbouring estate, on whose account poor Oswald was later to suffer all sorts of torture, not just that caused by *diu gotinne Minne*. In 1421 he writes that 'wol dreuzehn jar und dannoch mer' he has remained true to his Sabine: in 1417 he had already married the Swabian girl Margarete von Schwangau, who appears in so many of his poems affectionately referred to as 'Gret' or 'Gredlein'. His marriage with Margarete was, so far as can be judged from his highly erotic lyrics, at least in most respects a happy one, although Oswald does appear to have wandered from time to time in quest of pastures new. One such lapse in 1421 took him over onto the neighbouring estate, no doubt to press once more for the *genade* of Sabine (or, being Wolkenstein, more probably for the 'ermlin, hant, prust lust an end!'). Considerable family rivalry existed between the Jägers and Wolkensteins: it was through his mother that Oswald had inherited one-third of the land-block of which the Jägers held the other two-thirds. This state of affairs obviously rankled in the minds of Sabine's brothers; thus when Oswald was lured onto the Jäger property by the fair decoy, he was taken prisoner by Martin Jäger. From 1421 till 1423 he spent an unhappy and, if his lyrics may be considered, a most uncomfortable time in prison. To these years belong his religious poems, his *Reue-und-Bekennntnisgedichte*. In these, he expresses a generally different mood from his earlier ebullience: an anxiety about the future, and in particular an uncertainty for his soul's salvation. He turns now not to earthly loves, but to the Virgin herself to soothe him in his hour of need and suffering: 'O Maria kint, so ste mir Wolkensteiner pei in nøeten, damit ich var in deiner hult.' In 1423 he was released from prison and travelled across to Heidelberg, on to Aix, thence to Hungary, where he joined once more the service of King Sigismund, with whom he had earlier been associated, and in whose name he had visited various Courts throughout Europe. He apparently returned for a time to his estate; Sabine's death in 1426 affected him deeply, despite her deception of him five years previously. In 1430 he became once more a Counsellor at the Court of Sigismund. Much of his former effervescence seems to have been quenched by the Martin Jäger episode—the latter part of his life is certainly much more 'normal' than his fiery, adventurous youth. Oswald died in 1445.

Not all the histories of literature recognise the worth and individuality of Oswald's poetry. Comments on his work centre on his

use of language, the immediate content and meaning of his lyrics and above all tend towards a comparison of Oswald with the Classical Minnesinger. Invariably his virile sensuality is seized upon to prove his 'Epigonentum', and the eroticism of certain of his lyrics (particularly his *Kneiplieder*) have led to all sorts of protests. Even Ehrismann remarks: 'Überhaupt fasst er die Liebe rein sinnlich auf, wird oft derb und obszön. Das ist nicht die ideale, den Mann veredelnde Huldigung des Minnesangs, es ist nur Fleischeslust, nur solche kann der wilde Sinnesmensch verstehen.'⁶ Such criticisms are based on another age, i.e. the Classical period of Middle High German literature—above all on the poetry of Walther von der Vogelweide. Fourteenth century literature springs from a fundamentally different type of society, and its poets, far from being 'Epigonen', had, in general, no knowledge at all of 'Classical' poetry. Oswald and his contemporaries lived in a chaotic society, the so-called 'Zeit der Auflösung' of German states. Unlike Hartmann, Walther, Wolfram and Gottfried they were incapable of reconciling the claims of God and the World.⁷ The poetry of the late Middle Ages tends to be either brutal, or deeply devout. Oswald's poetry is in this way typical of the age in which and for which it was written. But its brutality or devoutness is expressed in a style of brilliant and vigorous originality, as individual as that of Heinrich Wittenweiler,⁸ his best-known contemporary. Oswald's ironic humour is probably, in the field of style, his prime claim to uniqueness: certainly it is the feature most noted. *en passant*, by historians of literature. Schröder⁹ refers to Oswald's bewildering use of language, calling him: 'Ein eigenmächtiger und nicht eben sehr verantwortungsvoller Wortverwalter', then remarking '[er] erinnert gelegentlich fast an Fischart und Jean Paul, die grossen Humoristen, denn er will durchaus als Humorist verstanden werden'! Bruno Boesch,⁴ having drawn attention to the 'spontane Ichbezogenheit' of Oswald's lyric, continues: 'Doch unverkennbar zwiespältig ist dieses Ich, und nur durch das Mittel der Ironie und des befreienden Humors vermag er sich der ihn quälenden Weltangst gegenüber zu behaupten'. Ehrismann (*Geschichte*, p.455) gives quotations from a *Tagelied* (No. 12) and a *Mailed* (No. 36) to illustrate Oswald's 'unverständliche Wortschwelgerei', explaining immediately following the quoted lines: 'Der Dichter besitzt viel Humor, und so hat möglicherweise auch solches Gesprudel einen humoristisch gewollten Zug.' But the exact nature of Oswald's humour still awaits detailed investigation.

'Humour' is a difficult word to define: German 'Humor' would be subject to equally personal interpretations. Oswald's 'Wortschwelgerei' may or may not be particularly humorous. (in the ex-

amples given by Ehrismann as 'unverständlich' the individual words do in fact have a 'meaning')¹⁰—but this ebullient playing with sounds by Oswald is most probably not 'humoristisch gewollt'. Oswald's humour springs rather from a boisterous, often bizarre situation supported and enhanced by an individual but most appropriate use of words, sounds, and rhythms. As a typical example of this Wolkenstein humour one might choose his *Sauflied*, No. 42.¹¹

Wolauff, wir wellen slaffen!
 hausknecht, nu zünt ain liechtel,
 wann es ist an der zeit
 damit wir nicht verkaffen
 der letzt sei gar verheit.
 das leien, münch und pfaffen
 zu unsern weiben staffen,
 sich hüeb ain pöser streit.

Heb auff und lass uns trinken,
 das wir also nicht schaiden
 von disem gueten wein.
 und lämt er uns die schinken,
 so muess er doch herein.
 her kopf, nu lat euch winken!
 ob wir zu pette hinken,
 das ist ain klainer pein.

Nu sleich wir gen der türen.
 secht zue, das wir nicht wenken
 mit ungeleichem trit.
 was gilt des staubs ain üren?
 her wirt, nu halt es mit!
 wir wellen doch nicht züren,
 ob ir euch wert beküren
 nach pollinischem sit.

Her tragt den fürsten leise,
 damit er uns nicht velle
 auff gotes ertereich!
 sein lob ich immer preise,
 er macht uns freudenreich.
 ie ainer den andern weise!
 wirt, slipf nicht auff dem eise,
 wann es get ungeleich!

Hin slaffen süll wir walzen,
 nu fragt das hausdierlein,
 ob es gepettet sei.
 das kraut hat si versalzen.

darzue ain gueten prei.
was süll wir darumb kalzen?
es was nicht wol gesmalzen;
der schäden waren drei.

The milieu here chosen by Oswald is the local inn, the time well on into the night, and the main characters in a condition of magnanimous bonhomie. There is however a vague awareness that the time has come to break up the party: *wann es ist an der zeit*. The call is made upon the servant for a light, and the first verse ends with a dark reference to an ugly struggle which will arise if laymen, monks and priests have been with the tipplers' wives while the latter were *in taberna*—a nonsensical utterance, devoid of logic, but in keeping with the befuddled thinking of the drinkers! There is however a lingering unwillingness to bid good-night to 'herrn kopf' (the *Weinpokal*—cf. Lat. *testa*) and the good wine, even though the effect of *herrn kopf* upon their legs may be such that they must limp home—a minor worry! Verse 3 has the party at long last on its unsteady feet and making the first tentative steps towards home and bed. The atmosphere of the piece has been masterfully caught here: whispered orders to creep towards the door, making certain that none should sway 'mit ungeleichem trit'—a wonderfully felicitous exhortation! At this point, the thought takes an unforeseen plunge into a previous channel and returns to wine: 'was gilt des staubs ain üren' (Lat. *urna*)—what matter, if the wine were sludgy! After a cry to the landlord to come along with them, there is a reference to 'beküren' and 'pollinischem sit' illustrative of precisely that grossness, not to say grobianism, which marks German literature of this period. Verse 4 comes as something of a shock: a ruling prince is one of the party—in fact it is he who has arranged the *Sauferei*. He would appear to have been a better performer than the others who must now carry him out carefully in such a way that he does not fall 'to God's terrestrial realm'! The verse becomes a song of praise for the prince's generosity, a general call to nobody in particular that each should indicate to the other the way (home to bed), and a benevolent concern expressed for the well-being of the inn-keeper (probably the only sober one amongst them!), who must take care he doesn't slip on the ice. The last verse is a brilliantly contrived ending to this poem of drunkenness. The thought contained therein is as befuddled as the poet returning with the tipplers.

In such a poem, one finds that its effect lies chiefly in *Bild* and not in *Inhalt*, and it is in this portrayal of a situation that Oswald's universal humour lies. It springs from a boisterous, every-

day situation, unimportant in itself, yet related with a verve that makes an immediate effect upon his audience. The poet himself enters fully into the spirit of the occasion—in fact, his laugh is in great measure directed at himself. Oswald's is a completely extrovert humour, as can be seen in many another of his poems (cf. his *Fasnachtlied*: 'Es nahent gen der vasennacht', where Oswald, reduced to a crutch as a result of some amorous escapade, is nevertheless of good cheer: his strident voice resounding throughout the tavern, he celebrates Fasching by dancing with his crutch!—'Und ich die kruck vast an mich zuck./ freuntlichen under das üechsen smuck;/ ich gib ir manchen herten druck/, dass si muess kerren.' Or again the completely natural little twists of domestic humour that appear in the poems to his 'Gret': 'Liebes Gredel, zeuch die reuben auss./ kent ein, setz tue flaisch und kraut, eil, pis klueg!'—'Gret, lauff gen stadel, suech die nadel, nim den rechen mit!') Supporting the effect of verbal imagery, there is also the most successful use of rhyme and metre in the poem given. The rhythm is above all remarkable, and, with the 'klingende Kadenzen' broken on occasion by a 'stumpfe Kadenz'¹² goes far to suggest the effect of the wine upon the drinkers' thoughts and actions.

There can be no doubt that Bruno Boesch⁴ is justified in making his astute comment that Oswald's is a lyric of 'spontane Ichbezogenheit'; when he further elaborates his statement by pointing out that this *Ich* is 'zwiespältig . . . und nur durch das Mittel der Ironie und des befreienden Humors vermag er [Oswald] sich der ihn quälenden Weltangst gegenüber zu behaupten' his ground is not so sure. It appears that all discussion of mediaeval philosophy and literature must centre upon the ogre of 'memento mori', of 'media vitae in morte sumus' (in much the same way that discussion of modern literature seems to be supremely at home in considering the cataclysmic forebodings expressed in a morally and materially exhausted Western culture!) Oswald's *Ich* is anything but 'zwiespältig'; his 'Weltangst' is remarkably inconspicuous. Even in his *Gefangenschaftslieder*—where he comes closest to concern about his soul's salvation—he still manages to be lustily *diesseitig*, inverting the traditional Minnesang idea and making of the Virgin Mary a flesh-and-blood woman of worldly attributes: he expresses the wish to be received by her at Heaven's portal with a kiss! 'Ste fuer—die tuer—grausleicher not./ wenn sich mein haubt wird senken/ gen deinem—veinen—muendlin rot/ so tue mich lieb bedenken!' Could this, perhaps, be a Heine-like 'romantische Ironie'—'eine absichtliche Zerstörung einer dichterischen Stimmung' (Sprachbrockhaus)? From Wolkenstein, most probably not. In the other sense of the word 'Ironie' ('unter scheinbarer Anerkennung

versteckter Spott'—*Sprachbrockhaus*) one might be tempted to agree with Boesch amongst others that Oswald is an ironic writer, in that the poems he wrote—love-lyrics, domestic lyrics, travel-songs, battle-descriptions, drinking songs, etc.—are just an early example of that 'Barock Zerrissenheit' which finds expression in a refusal to take the affairs of this world seriously, for they are essentially transient, and yet at the same time one must live each moment of life as though it were the last, concentrating steadfastly in the midst of Life's cesspool upon the Hereafter and the salvation of one's soul. Such an interpretation of Oswald, however, would be hopelessly out of spirit with the content of his poems, one and all. It would be an outright denial of the strong, positively *diesseitig* personality of the man, to which the vast majority of his poems are testimony.

Oswald's poems are the product of a brutal, earthy age. They contain, like Wittenweiler's 'Ring', all the spirit and unadorned, healthy lustiness of the German fourteenth century, the *Herbst des Mittelalters*.

NOTES

¹ *Minnesangs Wende*, H. Kuhn, Tübingen 1952.

² Op.cit. vi Foreword.

³ Ehrismann; *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters*; Schlussband 1935, p.456.

⁴ B. Boesch; *Deutsche Literaturgeschichte in Grundzügen*, hrsg. Boesch, Bern 1946; p.96.

⁵ A rapid résumé of the major events in Oswald's life may be found in Stammler's 'Verfasserlexikon'. Ehrismann (*Geschichte*, p.452) also provides a brief summary of major details.

⁶ Ehrismann, *Geschichte*, p.454.

⁷ Immediate examples illustrative of this attitude in Classical Middle High German literature spring readily to mind, e.g. the 'driu dine' of Walther's Reichston, Wolfram's oft-quoted 'swes leben sich so verendet/ daz got nicht wirt gepfendet/ der sêl durchs lîbes schulde/ und der doch der werlte hulde/ behalten kan mit werdekeit: daz ist ein nütziu arebeit.' etc. For a complete discussion of the Gott, Welt problem see F. Ranke: *Gott, Welt und Humanität in der deutschen Dichtung des Mittelalters*; Basel 1952.

⁸ Heinrich Wittenweiler, author of the satiric 'Ring': an ironic parody of a changing age.

⁹ Schröder, 'Sprache und Wortschatz O.s von W.' in *Anzeiger für deutsches Altertum*, vol. 49 pp. 179-81.

¹⁰ Ehrismann suggests that the lines taken from a Mailed (No. 36): 'Da zissli muessli—fissli fuessli/ henne kluessli—kumt ins huessli/ werffen ain tuessli—susa suessli/ niena gruessli—well wir sicher han . . .' are examples of 'asyndetische Reihen und unverständliche Wortschwelgerei.' *Zissli muessli*

is probably a diminutive of M.H.G. zise—mûs, (cf. late Latin cisimus, mus citellus) i.e. squirrel. *Fissli fuessli* = M.H.G. viselen (to crunch), *fuessli* presents no problem—'little feet'. *Kluessli* is sometimes found in the M.H.G. form klutzen, more often though as klucken or glucken (Lat. glucidare). Thus the passage is not, in fact, completely devoid of meaning! *Tuessli* is a dice ('Ein Däuschen'?). Here again, the humour is largely a humour of situation, bordering on the incongruous!

¹¹ Ed:—'Die Gedichte O. von W.' hrsg. von J. Schatz, 2. Aufl. Göttingen 1904.

¹² A detailed account of M.H.G. lyrical measures may be found in Heusler's *Deutsche Versgeschichte* II, 163-341. In this poem the rhyme and melody-scheme may be given as follows:

A4kl a
A4kl b (Waise)
A4st c
A4kl a
A4st c
A4kl a
A4kl a
A4st c

This form is repeated in all verses and is perfectly regular in all.

SOURCES AND SUBJECT MATTER IN TWO SHORT STORIES BY GEORG HEYM

E. KRISPYN

University of Melbourne

GEORG HEYM, who lived from 1887 to 1912, has during the last decade become ever more widely recognized as an outstanding figure in the history of modern German poetry. Apart from Georg Trakl, he had no serious rivals in the expressionist movement of which he was an early exponent, and few if any poets have come up to his standard since.

Heym also tried his hand at other literary genres than lyric poetry. In his formative period he went through a phase, lasting several years, when he regarded himself primarily as a dramatist. Many plays were planned, a few wholly or partly written, and one actually published.¹ All were set either in antiquity or in mediaeval Italy. They are today of no more than academic interest.

Of far greater importance are his short stories, which date from 1910/1911. They all make good reading, and two of them, one dealing with the theft of the 'Mona Lisa' and the other with an

episode from the French Revolution, are moreover interesting as exemplifying Heym's treatment of his subject matter.²

The theft in August 1911 of the 'Mona Lisa' from the Parisian Louvre provided Heym with the basic idea and the setting of the story *The Thief*. However, of the actual incident only the broadest outline went into the making of this tale. Nor could it be otherwise, because the crime was not solved until 23 months after Heym's death. All he had to go on, therefore, was the more or less fanciful newspaper reports on the discovery of the theft.

Probably because the picture originated in Florence, Heym situated the denouement of his fictitious account in that city, in the future year 1914. By coincidence it was there that on 12 December 1913 the painting was recovered. Apart from this, there is no resemblance between Heym's reconstruction of the incident and the actual course of events.

Instead of the youthful Italian decorator Vincenzo Perugia, ex-employee in the Louvre, who claimed to have acted from an excess of nationalist zeal, Heym introduced as the thief an elderly religious maniac, who was prompted by his delusions and hallucinations. And whereas the portrait was finally restored to the museum unharmed, he made the thief destroy it in a frenzy of hatred.

Nevertheless, Heym's version of the theft and its aftermath is not pure invention. Several essential elements in it are based on an incident which took place half a year before the 'Mona Lisa' affair. On 13th January 1911, the Rembrandt painting known as the 'Nightwatch' was damaged as it hung in the Rijks-museum in Amsterdam. An unemployed ship's cook, H. Sigrist, attacked the picture with a cobbler's knife. But before he could do more than scratch the surface of the thick layer of dirt and varnish which then covered it, the museum guards intervened.

Although the 'Nightwatch' escaped virtually unscathed, the European press published faked photos designed to give an exaggerated impression of the extent of the damage. These were accompanied by articles written in highly sensational tones. Typical of these are the following lines, which opened a report in a German newspaper.³

'AN UNHEARD OF INFAMY has been perpetrated in Amsterdam on one of the very greatest masterpieces ever created by Man. In the famous State museum there the magnificent, the sublime Rembrandt-painting 'The Nightwatch' has been severely damaged by knife-cuts!'

It seems likely that these accounts of the 'Nightwatch' incident contributed more to the story *The Thief*, than did the theft of

the 'Mona Lisa'. Sigrist was said to have been insane; the behaviour of Heym's protagonist, who is referred to as 'the madman' and 'the lunatic', is typical of a schizoid personality with paranoid trends. For the attack on the Rembrandt painting a knife was used. The same type of weapon served the thief in the story to mutilate the portrait of Mona Lisa.

Once Heym, influenced by the occurrence in Amsterdam, adopted madness as the motive force behind the theft, he was forced to reject the only concrete fact known about the stealing of the 'Mona Lisa'. This thief suffers from a religious mania, which ultimately attached itself to the painting of La Gioconda as the symbol of evil. He feels the presence of legions of devils, who lurk behind it, waiting for the moment when they will burst forth from it to conquer the world.

He has been told by an angel of the Lord that he is to save mankind by destroying the picture. As all the forces of evil are concentrated in it, even to touch the frame is an audacity fraught with the most terrible dangers. As a consequence the thief stands in terrified awe of the portrait.

This being the case, it would never have done for Heym to let the protagonist of his tale act as Vincenzo Perugia did: tackle the painting quite disrespectfully with a set of carpenters' tools to remove glass and frame, and then roll up the canvas to hide it under his coat. For the sake of the integrity of his story Heym, in keeping with the feelings of fear he ascribes to the thief, makes him wrap the whole thing up in a parcel, which the guards are accustomed to see him carry.

Long before the disappearance of da Vinci's masterpiece, Heym was familiar with the painting, its background, and the various legends attached to it. He had obtained his knowledge from a romanticized biography of the painter by Mereschkowski, which was one of his favourite books.⁴

It has left its mark on the short story *The Thief* in several ways. In the separate chapter devoted to the portrait of Mona Lisa, Mereschkowski hints darkly at its magical qualities and dwells on the irresistible beauty of its subject. This may well have played a part in determining Heym's conception of the picture as teeming with demons, and of its thief as succumbing to its seductive charms, for which he denounces even his God. When the maniac finally does destroy the painting, it is not in order to save the world, but to revenge himself on the woman who spurns his love.

Another link between Mereschkowski's *Leonardo da Vinci* and Heym's *The Thief* is established by the occurrence of the same

biblical quotations, from Mark XV and Revelation XVII, in both works.

Heym's choice and adaptation of subject matter in 'The Thief' reveal some trends which recur throughout his work. The most important of these are an animistic approach to lifeless objects, and a preoccupation with mental abnormality. He expands Merezhkowski's allusion to the aura of supernaturalness which surrounds the 'Mona Lisa' into a veritable demonization of the painting. The suggestion that Sigrist's action was due to mental instability suffices to inspire a detailed and accurate study of schizoid symptoms.

On the subject of *The Thief* it is finally interesting to note that the same theme has been used by Thomas Mann. The short story *Gladius Dei*, from the collection *Tristan*, also deals with a religious maniac who regards a certain painting as evil and wants to destroy it. As this collection was first published in 1903, it is quite possible that Heym knew this story. There is no evidence, however, that he was ever interested in or impressed by Mann's works. It seems improbable, therefore, that *The Thief* owes anything directly to *Gladius Dei*.

The short story *The fifth of October* is based on the march of the Parisian masses on the royal palace at Versailles, which took place on that date in the year 1789. According to *The Cambridge Modern History*, what actually happened was this:

'On the morning of October 5 a crowd, in the first instance chiefly of women, although afterwards supported by men, assembled in the Place de Grève and began an assault on the Hôtel de Ville. Feebly resisted by the National Guards on duty, they forced their way in, seized a quantity of arms and were about to hang an Abbé whom they chanced to find there, when a certain Stanislas Maillard, who had taken part in the attack of the Bastille, raised the cry "To Versailles". The women followed him, and on the march were joined by crowds of male rioters.'

Instead of starting on a city square as the climax of a day of rioting, in Heym's story the march commences in the fields outside the city of Paris, where the crowds have gathered to await the arrival of a convoy of breadcarts. This deviation from reality is apparently made to exploit the dramatic effect of the striking contrast between the apathy of the waiting masses and their inspired willpower once they are galvanized into action.

Of greater significance are the changes Heym makes concerning Maillard's role in the proceedings. Actually, this Bastille vet-

eran took the initiative in the march on the royal residence, and placed himself at the head of the demonstrators. According to Heym, however, the words 'To Versailles' were uttered by an anonymous voice which expressed the will of the masses.

Maillard, in this version, is a prophet of gloom and a defeatist. His declaration that the people have no choice but to submit again to the tyranny of their overlords, rouses the masses from their lethargy; but this reaction is neither foreseen nor welcomed by Maillard. When the marchers get under way, he vainly tries to stop them by arguments and action, but he and his handful of helpers are swept aside by the 'iron battalions' of the people.

These drastic departures from the recorded facts reveal the basic trend of Heym's views on history. By using the masses as the embodiment of an irresistible force, and adapting the figure of Maillard to demonstrate in physical terms the futility of any attempt to interfere with it, he follows in the footsteps of his idol Büchner.

The latter uses Danton as a mouthpiece for his historical fatalism in the remarks: 'We have not made the Revolution, but the Revolution has made us', and: 'We are puppets, manipulated by unknown forces; nothing, nothing in our own right!'⁵ In a letter of spring 1834 to his betrothed, which Heym with his great interest in biographical details undoubtedly knew, Büchner stresses the pointlessness of opposing the 'iron law' of history.

If Heym's views lacked originality, in their expression he surpassed his model. The notions which Büchner in his play puts into words Heym translates into action, thus giving substance to abstract thoughts by means of his unique gift for personification.

In other respects, *The fifth of October* reflects a more direct influence of Heym's favourite authors. There are some similarities with Grabbe's play on Napoleon, in which the crowds are as antagonistic to bakers as those in *The fifth of October*.⁶ In both works allegations are made, that the famine has been brought about intentionally by those in power. A certain ironical designation of the Parisian market-women is also to be found in the play as well as the story.

In *The fifth of October* the historic incident with the cleric in the Hôtel de Ville is replaced by a similar episode, in which a baker is threatened with hanging, but let off after having been thoroughly humiliated. This is reminiscent of a scene from Grabbe's play, in which a tailor is murdered by ruffians from the Faubourg St. Antoine. It lacks a 'happy ending', but otherwise the circumstances are comparable. An indication of the connection between the two works lies in the fact that the coal-car-

Two Stories by Georg Heym

riers who wanted to kill the baker also hailed from St. Antoine.

This episode from *The fifth of October* shows a still closer resemblance to the scene from Büchner's *Danton*-play, in which the mob threatens to hang a young aristocrat. In view of Heym's great admiration for this author, there is little doubt that his baker is a direct descendant of Büchner's figure. Yet he has treated his model independently enough for a characteristic difference between the attitudes of the two writers to emerge.

In Büchner's play the motivation of the intended execution lies on a socio-political level. The citizens recognize the young man with the handkerchief as an enemy of their class, and as such want to hang him. Heym explains the incident with the baker in psychological terms, when he ascribes it to the mob's boredom and need for diversion.

The affair with the baker in *The fifth of October* also differs from the scene with the aristocrat in the play in the reasons for their respective reprieves. The latter owes his release to his wit. His remark that his would-be executioners would not see any clearer for his body hanging from the lamp post appeals sufficiently to the crowd for them to let him go. Both he and the mob are thus, by implication, credited with some subtlety of mind.

Heym is more pessimistic in this regard. His miserable, pusillanimous baker is as utterly incapable of making any spirited comment as his tormentors are of appreciating it. They let their victim go, simply because he begins to bore them, and because it starts raining.

NOTES

¹ *Die Athener Ausfahrt*, Würzburg, 1907.

² The stories *Der Dieb* and *Der fünfte Oktober* were published with five others under the title *Der Dieb*, Leipzig 1913. The stories were reprinted in the collected *Dichtungen*, München 1922. A complete edition of Heym's works including his diaries, letters, stories, plays and his poems will be published by Karl Ludwig Schneider at Ellermann, Hamburg.

³ *Neues Tageblatt und General Anzeiger für Stuttgart und Württemberg* or 14th January 1911.

⁴ *Leonardo da Vinci* von D. S. Mereschkowski. Leipzig 1912.

⁵ *Dantons Tod* von Georg Büchner. In: *Gesammelte Werke*, München 1958.

⁶ *Napoleon oder die hundert Tage* von Christian D. Grabbe. In: *Grabbes Werke*, Leipzig und Wien.

THE PHONETIC AFFILIATIONS OF CZECH

A. FRENCH

University of Adelaide

THE PURPOSE of this paper is briefly to outline the phonetic relationship between the modern Czech language and certain other Indo-European languages from the point of view of historical dialectology. A comparison of the Czech phonetic system to that of other languages, to be full and accurate, should first imply a complete analysis of Czech as a synchronic system, and then, on this basis, a full comparison could be made with other modern languages which had likewise been analysed. Such an attempt, desirable as it is, lies outside the scope of this paper. It will be sufficient here to indicate the main points of similarity and differences between Czech and other Slavonic languages, and the affiliations of the Slavonic group in general, and Czech in particular, to those languages which are broadly similar to them in development. This paper then, is based on the classical methods of historical linguistics, and is thus inevitably atomic rather than structural in its approach. The résumé of phonological data which it includes is not, of course, intended to 'explain' the present condition of Czech, but only to indicate certain parallelisms of development which are a part of speech history. It is a weakness of classical philology that it has tended, at times, to put forward theories of sound change based on slight recorded evidence, drawn from widely separated periods and dialects; in itself the evidence is not entirely trustworthy because of the gross gap which exists between the sounds of speech and their representation in writing: the connection between disparate phonological data is even more tenuous, since the methods of comparative philology inevitably imply an evolutionary process, whereas in fact changes in the literary record may equally be due to the entry into it of dialects which had preserved forms possibly more conservative than those which they superseded in the record.

In the case of Czech we are dealing with a language which was for much of its history that of a people accustomed to the use of alien languages in the ecclesiastical and political administration of its own country. For centuries Czech remained a popular, and in general a non-literary language, and foreign influences on it seem more in the field of lexicon than of phonetics or morphology. But it is by no means impossible that the writing of Czech was influenced by alien literary norms. The custom of writers to record, not the language they speak, but the language they feel they ought to speak, is too

well known to require any emphasis. Thus, in discussing the historical affiliations of Czech, we draw phonological data from literary sources whose phonetic accuracy is not above question, consequently we are debarred from arguing that the phonological series in the record represents a true phonetic development. Bearing this reservation in mind, we can approach the material, and indicate the sequences which make up the data of phonological development, using the word not in any evolutionary sense, but solely with reference to changes in the literary record.

Czech may be described as a complex of Slavonic dialects of which the best known is that of central Bohemia, centring on the city of Prague. The statistical division of the Czech-speaking people by local dialects has not yet been accurately accomplished, though work is at present proceeding under the auspices of the Czechoslovak Academy, and its finds, based on modern methods of phonetic analysis, should eventually increase very considerably our knowledge of the linguistic map of this part of Europe.

For general purposes however it is true to say that the central Bohemian dialect is the language of the largest group of Czech speakers, and this is the language with which this paper is mainly concerned: among other dialects of Czech which are well known for their folk literature may be mentioned the central Moravian dialect, especially identified with Hana, the south-eastern dialect of Moravia centring on Kiof, the North-Eastern Moravian dialect centring on Moravská Ostrava, and the South-Western dialect centring on Domálice.

In speaking of the Czech language we shall in general be referring to the central Bohemian dialect, this being not only the language of the largest dialectical group, but also that in which most of Czech literature (and some of Slovak literature) is written: since the capital city of the Czech lands, Prague, lies within its domain, it has long exerted a dominant influence on Czech speakers and writers even outside its own linguistic frontiers. Where other Czech dialects differ from Prague it is often felt by the Czechs themselves that these are local aberrations, even though claiming a folk literature of their own, and that central Bohemian is the true language to which educated Czech people everywhere more or less conform.

The phonetic correspondence between literary Czech and the popular language of Prague is still comparatively close, although certain sound changes in popular speech are not apparent in the literary record. These will be discussed in detail below; perhaps the most striking are the abolition of the historical phonetic distinction between *i* and *y*; the substitution of *i* for the long *e* (*ě*); the

substitution of (phon.) ej for i; and the use of the intrusive initial v e.g. vosm for osm. Nevertheless the gap between the written and spoken language, from the point of view of phonetics, is very small compared with the corresponding gap e.g. in English or modern Greek.

Within the Slavonic complex Czech and Polish are the two languages which make up the largest part of the West Slavonic linguistic group, and they stand in some respects apart not only from East Slavonic, centring on the Russian dialects, but also from South Slavonic, including Serbo-croat, Slovene, Bulgarian, and Macedonian. Within the West Slavonic group the languages nearest to Czech from the point of view of phonetics, are not the Polish dialects but the languages known as Low and High Sorbian, better known as Lusatian and Wendish. These latter are the survivors of a former linguistic mass which in mediaeval times extended deep into Prussia and Saxony. The Eastern advance of Germanic has left them as contiguous linguistic islands centring on Kottbus (Chósebuz) and Bautzen (Budyšin) respectively.

Apart from Lusatian and Wendish the Slavonic dialect which most nearly approaches Czech is Slovak; there are important phonetic differences between the two languages, and Slovak has an extensive literature of its own, though some of the earlier Slovak writers wrote in Czech. Although most Czech and Slovak speakers are comprehensible to each other the differences are such that it would be meaningless to argue that Slovak is a dialect of Czech, or vice versa. Considerable emphasis has been laid on the separateness of the languages by Slovak scholars and organs of Slovak opinion, and this tendency has recently been exemplified by changes in Slovak orthography. We shall mention below the main phonetic differences between Czech, Slovak, and Polish, and between Czech and the better-known dialects of East and South Slavonic. Before going into these details it will be well to mention, in broad outline, the relation between Slavonic as a group, and other groups of Indo-European represented by extant literary or spoken languages.

The oldest Slavonic language surviving to us in writing is that of Old Church Slavonic, comprising liturgical and ecclesiastical records, the original texts of which date back to the ninth and tenth centuries A.D. This literary activity was inspired originally by a school led by two scholarly missionaries, St. Cyril and St. Methodius, who came from Macedonia to Moravia to teach the Christian faith. The language which they spoke was of the South Slavonic dialect area: the language in which they wrote was not necessarily that native to themselves, but was designed to be comprehensible to a largely Moravian audience. Old Church Slavonic thus exhibits

The Phonetic Affiliations of Czech

characteristics later to be found in both South and West Slavonic, but in view of its Southern affiliations it has sometimes been termed Old Bulgarian. Experiments were made by the school in the use of an orthography entirely designed for Slavonic needs, and a number of manuscripts preserve this, the Glagolitic script, now thought to have been invented by St. Cyril. However the majority of our records are written in an alphabet known as Cyrillic, based on Greek with the addition of some characters to represent distinctively Slavonic sounds: this alphabet is named after St. Cyril because he was formerly thought to have invented it.

This alphabet has remained until today the basis for the orthography of Slavonic languages spoken by Slavs of the non-Catholic persuasion. Because of its antiquity Old Church Slavonic has been a centre of interest for Slavonic philologists, and the comparison of modern Slavonic languages with the old church language has provided a basis for reconstruction of a theoretical unitary Old Slavonic language. It is possible that because the only surviving classical Slavonic language is based on a dialect of South Slavonic, theoretical reconstructions of Old Slavonic have been influenced too far in that direction.

In addition the situation is complicated by the fact that the church language itself influenced the development of other Slavonic languages by its use in the liturgy and scriptures etc; thus it is not uncommon to find dual forms in the same language, of which one form is a normal dialectical development, the other a borrowing from the church language: e.g. Czech 'rozpoltiti' beside the church 'razplatiti'.

The relationship between the old church language and the theoretical reconstructed language known as Old Slavonic is complex, and for our present purposes it is sufficient to bear in mind that certain features of Czech may well be representative of Slavonic, in its unitary aspect, without necessarily finding any echo in Old Church Slavonic, nor is it impossible that modern Czech preserves features of Slavonic which had disappeared in South Slavonic of a thousand years ago. Nevertheless for general purposes it is useful to consider Slavonic as a group of which the earliest records belong to one dialectical area, and to note its proximity first to the group of languages generally known as Baltic, that is, Lithuanian, Latvian, and the now extinct Old Prussian, and then to the Satem group of languages, in particular to Old Indian. In considering the phonetic affiliations of Czech we may consider the features which it, and other Slavonic languages, have in common with the Baltic and Indo-Iranian group; the features in which it, together with the other Slavonic languages, differs from these

groups; and the features in which it differs from other Slavonic languages.

The so-called Satem group of languages, i.e. Balto-Slavonic and Indo-Iranian, is distinguished from the Centum group in particular by the development of the Indo-European palatal stops *k*, *g*, and *gh*.

The latter are formed by contact between the back of the tongue and the palate, the point of contact varying, in English, between the rear of the hard palate and the rear of the soft palate, the velum. Retrogressive assimilation greatly affects the point of contact: a high front vowel preceding or following the stop attracts the tongue forward before making contact to form the stop: a back vowel tends to attract it backwards. Since the tongue is forced to make a greater movement to form a palatal stop than for a velar stop, it is natural that the actual duration of the contact in a palatal stop should be shorter. For this reason a stage may be reached when the tongue, hurrying to take up position for the sound to succeed the stop, makes only momentary contact, and in that case a noticeable feature associated with the stop is the sibilant off-glide which accompanies the release: the way is then open for contact to be omitted entirely, and the stop to be replaced by a fricative.

The Centum languages have been by no means immune from the tendency to replace stops with fricatives and examples are to be seen e.g. in modern French. What distinguishes the Satem from the Centum group is the completion of this phonetic shift at an early period. There is no evidence that this shift occurred in Slavonic at the same time as in the other Satem languages, but its completion was a fact at a time earlier than the first Slavonic writings surviving to us. But Slavonic had already generalised the sound change more than was the case in other languages, and stops which remained as velars in Sanskrit are found in Slavonic attracted forward wherever possible. Thus Czech shows the results not only of the Satem sound shift, but also of two other shifts, affecting the velar stops, known as the Slavonic palatalisations.

With regard to the Satem sound change, the following may be cited as examples: the numeral 'ten' appears in Greek as *δέκα*, in Latin as *decem*, but in Sanskrit as *dāśa*, in Lithuanian as *dėšimt*, in Russian as *desjat'*, and in Czech as *deset*:

the word *οἶκος* (earlier *folkos*) in Greek, and *uicus* in Latin, corresponds to the Sanskrit *viś*, the Polish *wieś*, and the Czech *ves* = a village.

Thus a 'k' in Greek and a 'c' in Latin correspond to 'ś' in Sanskrit, 'š' in Lithuanian, and 's' throughout the Slavonic group. On the

The Phonetic Affiliations of Czech

other hand, 'g' in Greek and Latin corresponds to the voiced dental affricate j (phon. dʒ) in Sanskrit, voiced post-alveolar fricative 'ž' in Lithuanian, and the voiced pre-alveolar fricative 'z' in Slavonic: e.g.

γγνώσκειν in Greek, and *gnoscere* in Latin correspond to *žinoti* in Lithuanian and *znáti* in Czech.

In Balto-Slavonic the Indo-European aspirated voiced stop 'gh' fell together with the unaspirated stop in its development, unlike Latin, Greek, and Sanskrit which separate them, though the development is different in each case: e.g.

the Sanskrit *himah*, the Greek χειμών and the Latin *hiems*, correspond to the Lithuanian *žëma* and the Czech *zima* = winter.

Passing reference may here be made to a feature of development of the I.E. velar stops 'k', 'g', 'gh'. In the Greek and Latin their development is such as to suggest that in the unitary I.E. language each of the stops represented two distinct phonemes, namely a pure velar without lip rounding, and a labialised velar with lip rounding. In Greek and Latin the development of the pure velars differs from that of the labialised velars; in Sanskrit, as in Slavonic, the distinction disappeared, if it ever existed there, and in this negative aspect Czech is at one with the rest of the Balto-Slavonic group.

Throughout the group, as in Sanskrit, the I.E. vowels 'a' and 'o' fell together in their development, though the results were different. The short I.E. 'a' and 'o' appear in Sanskrit and Lithuanian as 'a'; in Slavonic as 'o'. The long I.E. 'a' and 'o' appear in Sanskrit as a long vowel 'a'; in Lithuanian generally as 'o'; in Slavonic as 'a': e.g.

Skt. *aksas* corresponds to Greek ἄξων Lith. *ašis*
Czech. *osa* = axle.

Latin *arare* corresponds to Greek ἀροῦν Lith. *arti*
Czech. *orati* = to plough.

Skt. *akṣi* corresponds to Lat. *oculus* Lith. *akis*
Czech. *oko* = an eye.

Skt. *tad* corresponds to Greek τό
Czech. *to* = it.

Skt. *bhratar* corresponds to Latin *frater* Lith. *brolis*
Czech. *bratr* = brother.

Skt. *jñatas* corresponds to Greek γνωτός Lith. *žinoti*
Czech. *znáti* = to know.

A. French

In general the vowel system of Slavonic, where it has diverged from other I.E. groups, has diverged from Indo-Iranian and from the Baltic group as well. The more notable developments are as follows.

The I.E. short vowels 'i', 'u' had already become ultra-short or fugitive vowels in Slavonic before the time of our earliest records, and the inventors of the Cyrillic script assigned new characters to these words in their orthography. These vowels, generally termed the 'jers', were far enough from the Greek sounds represented by iota and upsilon to be assigned a fresh character in the Slavonic orthography, yet near enough to transliterate the Greek sounds: the jers were also near enough to each other to be frequently confused in Old Church Slavonic texts. In Czech, as in other Slavonic languages, where the jers were in 'weak' position in a word (e.g. as a final vowel, or in a syllable followed by a syllable containing a full vowel) the jers were lost: e.g.

| | | |
|---------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Skt. <i>vidhava</i> | O.Ch.Sl. <i>vidova</i> | Cz. <i>vdova</i> = a widow |
| Lat. <i>ouis</i> | Lith. <i>avis</i> | Cz. <i>ovce</i> = a sheep |
| Greek <i>μέθυ</i> | Lith. <i>medus</i> | Cz. <i>med</i> = honey |

Where the jers were in strong position in a word they both appear in Czech normally as 'e'. e.g.:

| | | | |
|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|------------------------|
| Lat. <i>dies</i> | Lith. <i>diena</i> | O.Ch.S. <i>dñi</i> | Cz. <i>den</i> = a day |
| Lat. <i>muscus</i> | Lith. <i>musos</i> | O.Ch.S. <i>mŭchŭ</i> | Cz. <i>mech</i> = moss |

I.E. long 'i' appears throughout Slavonic normally as an 'i': long I.E. 'u' generally as a high, back vowel without lip rounding. In popular Czech this sound ('y' in the orthography) has tended to approach very closely the pronunciation of 'i', though the historical distinction between the two is imbedded in the rules of orthography: ('i' cannot be preceded by a 'hard' consonant, and where the sounds d, t, n, r, preceded it historically the consonants have been palatalised: e.g. the Old Church Slavonic form *rikati* beside the modern Czech *řikati* = to say). In the spoken language of Prague there is a general tendency to pronounce long 'y' as 'ej', though this is still regarded as a vulgarity.

When the I.E. sounds 'a', 'e', 'o' were followed by m/n, unless a vowel followed, the nasal consonants regularly disappeared in Slavonic after nasalising the preceding vowel: traces of a similar tendency may be observed in Classical Latin, where the elision of am, m, um, before a following vowel in verse clearly indicates that the consonant was not fully pronounced, and the same process is visible in French. The orthography of Old Church Slavonic recognises new characters for the nasal vowels resulting from this pro-

The Phonetic Affiliations of Czech

cess (o, e). Of the modern Slavonic languages only Polish preserves a nasalised vowel: in Czech 'am', 'om' normally appear as 'u'; I.E. 'em' as 'a', 'ě', or 'i'.

Greek ἀγκών Cz. *uhel* = an angle

Skt. *panca* Greek πέντε Cz. *pět* = five.

Where I.E. 'e' was the initial sound in a word, it appears in O.Ch.Sl. as *je*. This intrusion of the front semi-vowel remains general throughout Slavonic except in Bulgarian. e.g.

Skt. *asti* Gk. ἔστι O.Ch.Sl. *jestŭ* Cz. *jest* = is.

On the other hand I.E. long 'e' has become *je* throughout Slavonic in all positions, thus for many purposes falling together with I.E. short 'e'. e.g.

Gk. θήρ Latin *ferus* Cz. *zvěř* = beast.

Skt. *pad* Latin *pes* Cz. *pěšky* = (on) foot.

Finally, the Slavonic languages diverge from all other groups of I.E. by their practice of adopting an intrusive 'v' before initial 'o'. This practice, which is still accounted a vulgarism in Czech, has been operative in the Slavonic languages since the time of our earliest records and has in numerous examples crept into the orthography: e.g.

Gk. ὀκτώ Russian *vosem'* Cz. *osm* = eight

This is one important respect in which literary Czech differs from the vernacular of Prague where it is hardly possible to find an initial 'o' to which an intrusive 'v' has not become attached; but Czech orthography rarely recognises this development.

We have noted those respects in which Slavonic has diverged, in its vowel system, from the Indo-Iranian and Baltic groups. The following divergencies are to be noted in its consonantal system. It is often assumed that a full range of aspirated, as well as unaspirated stops existed in I.E. in its theoretical unitary form, though the evidence is meagre as regards the aspirated breathed stops *ph*, *kh*, *th*.

Of the languages here under consideration it is only Sanskrit and Greek which preserve both sets of stops side by side; elsewhere either aspirated or unaspirated stops became generalised and in consequence, the necessity to distinguish them in the orthography disappeared; e.g. in English the voiced stops are normally unaspirated, the breathed stops aspirated, but this distinction is not reflected in English orthography. In Slavonic all the aspirated stops

fell together with the unaspirated in their development, as they did in the Baltic group, while Sanskrit and the Centum languages generally show divergent developments of aspirated from unaspirated stops. In Czech to English ears, all the stops are marked by a pronounced absence of aspiration.

In Sanskrit the I.E. *bh* survives; in Greek the stop was unvoiced *bh* > *ph* (φ): in Latin it appears the labio-dental breathed fricative 'f': in Balto-Slavonic the aspirate has disappeared: e.g.

Skt. *bharami* Greek φέρω Latin *fero* Lith. *beriu*
Cz. *beru* = I bear

In Sanskrit I.E. 'dh' survives: in Greek the sound appears as 'th' (θ); in Latin the stop became a fricative: e.g.

Skt. *dhumas* Greek θυμός Latin *fumus* Lith. *dúmai*
Cz. *dým* = smoke.

Before the time of the earliest Slavonic records the Greek φ had developed into a spirant, and the Greek character is so used in O.Ch.Sl. in transliterating loan-words in which the sound occurred. The sound likewise appears in Czech in numerous loan words: e.g. *feudální*, *film*, *foto* etc.

In Sanskrit I.E. palatal or velar 'gh' appears as 'h' or 'gh', in Greek as *kh* (χ); in Latin the development was complex, depending on the quality of following sounds. In Balto-Slavonic the aspirated falls together with the unaspirated stop.

The development of the stop was itself complex, giving different results in Baltic and Slavonic, and among the Slavonic languages themselves, e.g.

Skt. *grhas* Greek χόρος Latin *hortus* Lith. *gařdas*
O.Ch.Sl. *gradŭ* Cz. *hrad* = a castle

Thus Balto-Slavonic differs as a group from Indo-Iranian in that the former confuses the aspirated with the unaspirated stops whereas the latter keeps them apart; on the other hand the Balto-Slavonic group itself diverges in its development of the resulting stops.

The Satem sound shift, which Lithuanian and the Slavonic languages had shared with Sanskrit, had eliminated the class of originally palatal stops by converting them into fricatives. But the gap left by the disappearance of the palatal stops seems later to have been filled in Slavonic by the attraction forward of velar stops wherever possible. When the velars had been attracted into post-palatal position the way was then open for them to be replaced by

The Phonetic Affiliations of Czech

post-alveolar affricates $k > \check{c}$ (phon. tj): $g > d\check{z}$ (phon. dʒ). This sound shift, which was completed throughout Slavonic by the time of the first records, is generally known as the First Slavonic Palatalisation. This sound change marks off Slavonic from the rest of the Satem group i.e. not only from Indo-Iranian, but also from the Baltic languages, in which the stops remained. The conversion of the I.E. velar stop into a Slavonic affricate was carried through wherever the phonetic circumstances were favourable; that is, wherever the stop was followed in Slavonic by a front vowel which by retrogressive assimilation could attract the stop forward: in cases where the stop was followed by a back vowel or consonant the stop became palatal, but remained as a stop: e.g.

Skt. *catvarah* Greek τέτταρες Latin *quattuor* Lith. *keturi*
Cz. *čtyři* = four.

Greek κολωνός Latin *celsus* Lith. *kelti* Cz. *čelo* = forehead.

On the other hand the Latin *catulus* corresponds to the Czech *kotě* = cat; and the Greek κρέας to the Czech *krev* = blood.

At a late stage of Common Slavonic the old I.E. diphthongs 'ai, oi' fell together as 'ě' (phon. jɛ), and 'ei' became 'i'. As a result of this change in combinations where post-palatal stops had preceded the diphthongs, the palatalising influence of the new vowels now attracted the stops forward in a shift generally termed the Second Slavonic Palatalisation: $k > c$ (phon. ts); $g > z$. This sound change again distinguishes Slavonic from the Baltic and Indo-Iranian groups. e.g.

compare the Greek ποιμή with Sanskrit *cáyate*, Lith. *kainà* Cz. *cena* = a price (Cz. c = phon. ts)

the Greek nominative plural λύκοι corresponds to the Cz. Nom. plural *vlci* = wolves

It may be noted that the Second Palatalisation affected words borrowed from the German e.g. *Kaiser* appears in Czech as *císař*.

The I.E. back semi-vowel 'u' developed into a voiced fricative 'v' in Slavonic, as it did in Baltic and Sanskrit (and in the Romance Languages). In Greek the semi-vowel had disappeared between Homeric and classical times except as the second element in a diphthong; in Germanic the semi-vowel remained. In this case then, Czech development is at one with the Baltic, Indian, and Romance groups, and opposed to Greek and Germanic. e.g.

Skt. *veda* Gk. οἶδα Lat. *uideo* Cz. *vidím* = I see

The I.E. diphthongs eu, ou, fell together in Slavonic as in Baltic;

in the former generally as 'ov', in the latter as 'av'. When followed by a consonant or the semi-vowel 'j' they appear in Lithuanian as 'au', in Slavonic generally as the vowel 'u'. In old Czech the orthography shows the Slavonic 'u', in modern Czech the old diphthong reappears. e.g.

Gk. *πλεύσαι* Lith. *pláuti* O.Ch.Sl. *pluti* O.Cz. *pluti*
mod. Cz. *plouti* = to sail

Where I.E. 'u' was followed by a short 'i' or 'u' which was itself followed by a consonant in the same syllable, the disappearance of the short vowel left in Slavonic new clusters of semi-vowel + consonant: e.g.

Skt. *vidhava* Lat. *uidua* Cz. *vdova* = a widow.

There is a strong tendency in Czech to unvoice the fricative 'v': although assimilation is normally retrogressive in Czech, 'v' seems never to voice preceding breathed consonants; on the other hand it has been itself unvoiced when it preceded breathed consonants e.g. *včera* = yesterday (where v = phon. f); or before vowels e.g. *vous* = a whisker (phon.fous): the pronunciation of *vzteč* = anger (phon. fstek) shows the unvoicing of 'v' at two removes: in addition, final 'v' is regularly unvoiced in Czech e.g. *krev* = blood (phon. kref).

The unvoiced fricative 'f' thus appears in the Czech phonetic system both through the development of the voiced fricative from an original semi-vowel, and also in loan words from an originally aspirated stop: (e.g. Cz. *flotila*, the loan word, beside the Slavonic '*plouti*' = to sail).

So far we have noted ways in which Czech, and the Slavonic group in general, show signs of development similar to those in Indo-Iranian and the Baltic group, and ways in which it differs from these groups. We may now consider ways in which Czech is distinguished in its phonetic development not only from the non-Slavonic languages, but also from other members of the Slavonic group.

The I.E. voiced velar stop 'g' had generally been eliminated in Slavonic by conversion to an affricate or fricative, except where the stop was followed by a back vowel or consonant. In contrast to most Slavonic languages Czech, from about the thirteenth century A.D., eliminated the surviving examples of the voiced post-palatal stop by replacing it with an aspirate. In this sound change Wendish, Slovak, and Ukrainian also participated. e.g.

Greek *ζυγόν* Latin *iugum* Russian *igo* Czech *jho* = a yoke
compare Skt. *bhagas* Greek *φάγειν* O.Ch.Sl. *bogŭ*
Cz. *bůh* = a god.

The Phonetic Affiliations of Czech

In traditional loan words from the German, Czech, having no 'g' in use, converted the German 'g' into a 'k'. e.g.

Aukšpurk for Augsburg, *ksicht* for Gesicht.

In comparatively recent loan-words 'g' has returned to Czech; e.g. *generál*, *brigáda* etc.

In their development of the liquids, the Slavonic languages diverge generally from other members of the I.E. group, and Czech diverges from other members of the Slavonic group. The liquid consonants are capable of tremendous variations in their enunciation, and confusion between the liquids is a common feature of many languages.

There seems a common tendency to generalise one of the two liquids e.g. in English the elimination of 'r' except before vowels, and the reduction of friction even in this position: in Sanskrit both I.E. liquids appear as 'r'; in Greek, Latin, and Lithuanian they are usually kept apart. In Slavonic their development is best considered under two main headings; (a) when followed by a vowel; and (b) when followed by a consonant.

In Czech, alone of the Slavonic languages, a high front vowel ('i' or 'e') following an 'r' has had the effect of softening the 'r' to 'ř' (a trilled alveolar fricative): a similar result seems to have been given in Polish but the sound was later modified to phon. 3, the orthography still preserving a representation of the trilled fricative ('rz'). e.g.

Latin *tres* Lith. *tris* Pol. *trzej* Cz. *tři* (Slovak *tri*).

In this case then Czech resembles more closely Polish than Slovak, which has in such examples a plain untrilled 'r' (Cz. *moře*, Slovak *more* = sea).

When the liquid was followed by short 'i', 'u', the reduction of the vowel in Slavonic, and its disappearance in weak position, brought the liquid into direct contact with following consonants. The result was, in Czech and Serbo-croat, that the liquid became a sonant: e.g.

Greek *κρέας* Serbo-croat *krv* Cz. *krv-avý* (adj.) bloody

Lith. *pluta* O.Cz. *plet*, genitive sing. *plti* = complexion

(mod. Cz. *pleti*)

When the liquid was followed by a consonant there was generally a modification of the preceding vowel in Slavonic, and a metathesis of vowel and liquid, except in Russian. When the liquid was preceded by an initial vowel (the so-called 'ort' formula, where 'o' = any vowel, 't' = any consonant) metathesis occurs throughout the Slavonic group.

A. French

Since I.E. short 'a' > Slav 'o', in Russian, Polish and Czech I.E. *art*, *ort* fell together as *rot*. On the other hand in South Slavonic and Slovak I.E. *art*, *ort* fell together as *rat*, implying that the vowel had earlier been lengthened in these languages (I.E. long a/o > Sl. a). e.g.

Lat. *arcus* corresponds to Bulgarian *rakita*, Cz. *rokyta*, but Slovak *rakyta* = a willow

Where the vowel preceding the liquid was itself preceded by a consonant in I.E. (the 'tort' formula), metathesis was general in Slavonic except in Russian, where two syllables resulted. The I.E. vowels a/o appear in South Slavonic, Czech, and Slovak as 'a', in Polish and Russian as 'o': thus Czech which in the development of the 'ort' formula fell together with Polish and Russian, in the development of the 'tort' formula fell together with Slovak and the South Slavonic dialects: I.E. 'er' appears in South Slavonic as 'ř' (phon. rje), in Czech as ře. e.g.

Lith. *galva* Pol. *glowa* Russian *golova* Cz. *hlava* = a head

Lat. *calamus* Russian *soloma* Cz. *sláma* = straw

(The Latin sound reappears in the Czech loan word *kalamář* = a pen).

We have noted the development of the sonant liquids in Czech and Serbo-croat as a result of the elimination of vowels following the liquid consonant. One of the most striking phonetic features in Czech and Serbo-croat is the survival, (or reconstruction), of what seem to have been sonant liquids in the parent I.E. language. Both liquids appear in Sanskrit as sonant 'r': intrusive vowels appear before the liquids in Greek, Latin, and Lithuanian; and the sonant has thus become consonantal.

In Slavonic the variety in the development of I.E. sonant l/r in the modern languages would suggest that the sonant liquids both survived in Common Slavonic. In Old Church Slavonic texts I.E. sonant l/r sometimes appear as sonants (i.e. without a following vowel), generally as followed by the ultra-short vowels ĭ. ŭ. In the modern Slavonic languages sonant 'r' is still found not only in Czech but also in Slovak, Serbo-croat, and Slovenian. Sonant 'l' is also found in Czech and Slovak. e.g.

Skt. *urna* Lith. *vilna* O.Ch.Sl. *vŭlna* Cz. *vlna* = wool.

Skt. *vrkas* Lith. *vilkas* Cz. *vlk* = wolf.

Skt. *mrtas* Lat. *mortuus* Serbo-croat *mrtav* Cz. *mrtvý* = dead

In Old Czech, in consequence of the palatalisation of preceding

consonants, there occurred the vowel changes $\acute{a} > \check{e}$, and $u > i$ where conditions were favourable, i.e. except before hard consonants. The first of these changes was to mark off the morphological system of Czech from other Slavonic languages by transforming the old feminine declension ending in *-a* to one ending in *-e*, e.g.

Cz. *duše* = spirit beside O.Ch.Sl. and Russian *duša*

Cz. *jítro* = morning beside Serbocroat *jutro* and Russian *utro*.

Slovak is not unaffected by these changes but the situation there is confused, with some examples of the Czech forms admitted in some dialects of Slovak, while some Czech dialects likewise preserve the older forms.

We have seen that nasal consonants preceded by *a*, *e*, or *o* regularly disappeared in Slavonic after nasalising the preceding vowel. In Czech the resulting nasal vowel 'ĕ' diverges in its development in accordance with the quality of the succeeding sounds; e.g. the numeral 'five' appears in Czech as '*pěť*' (lit. *penki*), beside the adjective *pátý*.

In Slovak the development is similar but not identical. *pät'* beside the adjective *piaty*. In Polish alone the nasal vowel is preserved, *pięć* beside the adjective *piąty*. In South Slavonic an ordinary 'e' results; e.g. Serbo-croat *pet/peti*: in Russian the result is phon. *ja: pjať/pjaty*.

Apart from their pattern of development of the individual sounds, Czech and Slovak stand apart from the rest of the Slavonic group by their retention of a system of differential vowel quantity and of a fixed stress accent. Common Slavonic had inherited a vowel system which included a correspondence of long and short vowels, a tonic accent, and system of free stress. Changes had reduced the Slavonic long vowels to five:

a < I.E. *ā*, *ō*

ě < I.E. *ē*, and the diphthongs *ei*, *ai*.

y < I.E. *ū*

i < I.E. *ī*

In addition the nasalisation of the I.E. vowels followed by nasal consonants had added two more, *ę*, *ǫ*, and the vacant place in the upper back row of vowels, caused by the forward movement I.E. *ū* > Sl. *y*, had been filled by the simplification of the diphthong *ou* > *u*.

Slavonic seems to have been left at this stage with only two short vowels, 'o' and 'e', and the ultra-short jers *ĭ*, *ŭ*. The development

of the Slavonic languages in historical times had the general effect of bringing a new symmetry to this phonetic pattern by means of the sound changes mentioned above, e.g. by the abolition of the ultra-short vowels, and the reduction of long vowels in final or unstressed syllables.

Changes in vowel quantity were closely linked to changes in the system of stress, under conditions which are now by no means clear; but the present position can be summed up as follows. The tonic accent has survived as such only in Serbo-croat and Slovene, though the results are not identical, and these two languages also preserve differences of vowel quantity. In East Slavonic and Bulgarian, stress is free, and vowel quantity is affected by a shortening of unstressed vowels. The orthography does not recognise differences of vowel length, and these play no part in the phonemic systems of the languages, i.e. the shortened vowels are treated as allophones of the long vowels.

In the West Slavonic languages the stress accent is fixed, in Czech and Slovak on the first syllable, in Polish on the penultimate; (in Macedonian, alone among the South Slavonic languages, there is a fixed stress on the pre-penultimate). In West Slavonic there is no serious shortening of vowels in unstressed position, and in Polish (as in Lusatian) there is no general variation of length. Czech and Slovak alone have moved to a position where a system of fixed stress is maintained, while preserving a complete correspondence of long and short vowels. It is interesting to note that the phonemic symmetry has been upset, in vernacular Czech, by the virtual elimination of long 'e' (ě), and its replacement by 'i'; e.g. *mliko* for *mléko* = milk. At the same time the phonetic gap left by the disappearance of the long 'e' is at present being filled by the lengthening of short 'e'; e.g. *né* for *ne*. In this case it looks as though the phonetic symmetry will emerge intact, while the phonemic structure is simplified by the reduction in the number of long vowels used for semantic differentiation.

This brief résumé should give some idea of the Czech development, in its main essentials, of the I.E. phonological system. One can observe tendencies to innovation, e.g. the development of the trilled 'ř' and the conversion of 'g' to 'h'; side by side with evidence of extreme conservatism e.g. the survival of the liquid vocalics. In its main lines the development of Czech is in harmony with that of other West Slavonic languages, yet in the development of $g > h$ it parts company with Polish and is at one with Ukrainian: in the development of the 'tort' formula it is in harmony with Serbo-croat and opposed to Polish and Russian, while in the 'ort' formula it falls together with these two languages and is differentiated from

Serbo-croat and Slovak. The conventional grouping into East, West, and South Slavonic is a useful device for the description of general trends, but the briefest examination of Czech historical phonology will show that the frontiers of these linguistic areas are intersected at a score of points.

BOOK REVIEWS

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE GREEK THEATRE. Peter D. Arnott. London, Macmillan, 1959, pp. xvi—240.

In 1956 I saw a performance of the *Birds* of Aristophanes presented on a stage-set about three feet wide and two feet high. I was sitting 100 feet from the set in a large hall and before the lights went out I comforted myself with the thought that Greek drama was Greek drama and that, as a person professionally involved, I should lend my patient support even to the sillier manifestations of it. Then the lights went out and Mr Arnott began. Gaily-costumed puppets very quickly created a convincing world in their own dimension. The hall became the theatre of Dionysus and for an hour and a half it was 414 B.C. With only one voice, Mr Arnott managed to let his jaunty translation speak in the varied accents of individuals, with only ten fingers he brought 21 speaking characters on and off at speed and manipulated a handful of chorus without breaking the stride of the action for a second.

This book is the statement of a man who, in his puppet theatre and in large-scale production, has been faced with all the problems involved in carrying an ancient play to an audience. I know of no book on ancient theatre quite like it. There are plenty of books which fight to break new ground in our understanding of the material equipment or the elusive thought of ancient plays. It is seldom that the non-specialist reader leaves them with the feeling that he has been present at a discussion on a form of entertainment. There are plenty of books by men of the theatre which devote chapters 1 and 2 to ancient drama, but those chapters too often suggest that an act of homage has been performed by someone moving out of his field. This book is written by a man of the theatre who is also a classical scholar. The scholar has done his work well, but has for the most part concealed himself by a remarkable feat of self-effacement. There is not a footnote in the book. There is no bibliography. Mr Arnott has chosen to talk about Greek drama to an audience that is not the world of scholarship or even the Greek Sixth Form, but that heterogeneous group of human beings who like to go along and see a good play.

It is this tone, unacademic yet informed, which sets the book apart. It opens with a splendid chapter on the conventions of Greek theatre which are likely to disturb a modern audience accustomed to a theatre of illusion. We are then taken into the conditions of writing, producing and acting which dictated the kind of performance given plays in the ancient world, and the ancient audience is examined. Then follow full accounts of five plays—the *Agamemnon* of Aeschylus, the *Medea* and *Cyclops* of Euripides, the *Birds* of Aristophanes and (to let us see the form of Greek New Comedy in its

Book Reviews

Roman setting) the *Menaechmi* of Plautus. There are chapters on translation and on the survival of ancient plays into our modern world, in Greek, in translation, and in adaptation. Finally there is an appendix giving hints to producers of ancient plays.

The opening chapters on the conditions surrounding the performance of Greek plays give a neat summary in layman terms of the facts now generally accepted. Mr Arnott has no wish to parade evidence or argue contentious points. In the many areas where doubt or plain ignorance still exists he will summarize the possible answers and express a gentle leaning to the one he favours. (But it is surprising to find that he gives to Athens in the 5th century B.C. a permanent stone theatre building, a stage four or five feet high and thick-soled boots for the tragic actors. He is guessing against the evidence).

The major part of the book is devoted to the five plays. Occasionally difficult points of interpretation are debated but the main purpose of each of these chapters is simply to stage a performance, in words. Excerpts in Mr Arnott's own translation carry us through the plot, but he is concerned with more than plot. He tries to see and hear everything for us. The theatre, the costumes, the pose and gestures of the actors are visualized. We are made aware of the music accompanying the action, of the swing of the dancing chorus, even of the weather and the hard seats. We are led on to appreciate the small details of stage-craft, to follow what may have been the emotional graph of the ancient audience. These are exciting re-creations. The translations are splendid, though I wondered if the very conventional rhythm of the tragic excerpts would 'speak' well in performance today. Of course Mr Arnott should know best: unlike most translators he has performed his lines in his own person.

With each play some biographical detail is filled in for the playwright and an attempt is made to assess the social and political atmosphere of the times. These sections are a little disappointing—they attempt to say so much so quickly that they read rather like itemized clichés. After the freshness of vision with which the plays are looked at, these comments can sound commonplace and even naive. One other criticism that could be made of this part of the book concerns the selection of plays. It seems a pity that Sophocles is given only passing mention while the *Cyclops* of Euripides gets a whole chapter. Mr Arnott is speaking to people interested in a living theatre and the space devoted to a satyr-play rather than to the *Oedipus Tyrannus* or the *Antigone* seems the one 'academic' intrusion in the book.

The last three sections of the book—on translation, the Greek play today and production—are everywhere useful and perceptive, but each of them left the impression of a big subject given cursory treatment, diluted and generalized to fit the book's unpretentious plan. This is especially true of the chapter on production, a field in which Mr Arnott is obviously equipped to make an important statement. Four pages are not enough. They are excellent pages but they sound like shorthand.

With most of these criticisms it is probably true to say that Mr Arnott is being condemned for not doing what he chose deliberately and for very good reason not to do. Mr Arnott, like the playwrights he admires, has first elected his audience and he has steered his book straight at them without condescension or sentimentality. And in the modest limits within which he has chosen to speak, he has given us an extremely valuable book.

University of Melbourne

G. H. GELLIE

GREEK ART AND LITERATURE, 700-530 B.C.; the beginnings of modern civilization (de Carle lectures, 1959). T. B. L. Webster. *Dunedin, University of Otago Press, 1959.*

It was a happy inspiration on the part of the University of Otago to bring out Professor Webster from London as the visiting de Carle lecturer for 1959 and thus enable him to complete the parallel history of Greek art and literature from Homer to Menander which he had begun twenty years earlier with a volume covering the period 530-400 and continued in 1956-58 with volumes on the fourth century and 'From Mycenae to Homer'. His theme, as suggested by the sub-title and developed in the introduction, is the great leap which brought the Greeks out of the aristocratic and formalised world of Homeric epic and Geometric vase-painting into the modern world of individual responsibility as typified by 'the swagger of Archilochos, the great stormy figures of proto-Attic vases, the tremendous imagery of Solon, the Gorgon of Corfu, the widely different ecstasies of maenads and fat men'. It is dealt with in four chapters, of which the first 'The Characters in their Setting' links the new world with that of Mycenae, thanks to the recent decipherment of Linear B. Next 'The Individual and his Responsibility' is looked at through the medium of poetry and art, and then we proceed to 'The Origins of Drama' which is seen as 'a new method of presenting the old heroic stories so that the heroes of the past appeared as men of the present acting and speaking in relation to each other', a new phenomenon which had arisen out of Dionysiac ritual. The final chapter tells of 'The Beginnings of Philosophy and Science', which the author attributes to the momentous change which brought about 'the new view that the world is explicable in terms of mechanical models and is therefore more amenable to technology than to magic, and that the scientist's choice of models is based on observations which anyone can check and justified by arguments which anyone can follow and control'.

Archaic Greece is a fascinating topic, with, as the writer suggests, not a little of the glamour of the Renaissance. The seventh and sixth centuries B.C. were a time of rapid development in almost every field of human endeavour, especially in art, literature, philosophy and politics, and they saw the birth of many of the ideas which mark the beginning of European civilization. Recent discoveries and excavations have made the picture a great deal clearer than it used to be, but much is still obscure and the conventional sources are more than usually fragmentary or incomplete. Webster's approach is particularly valuable for a period such as this, since he tries to survey its achievement in the round, seeing literature, art and philosophy as different reflections of a single whole, each of which has some light to throw both on the whole and upon each of the others as well. With the material at his disposal this is no light task, and if the result strikes us at times as being curiously thin, this must be partly attributed to the inevitable need for compression which has driven the author to leave much out or take it for granted; it is also partly inherent in this method of the 'history of ideas'—how far can or should they be considered in isolation on the one hand from action, on the other from a study of the techniques of art and literature?

Thus at times Webster is led into making some great leaps of his own—such a statement as (p. 45) 'by the early fifth century the sculptors had given visible form to the new ideal of democratic man' can only assume real meaning in the light of a much fuller understanding of Greek sculpture and Greek democracy than this book can hope to give; so too the story of Greek drama (a particularly interesting chapter) contains much that is based upon

inferences back from the attitudes and approaches of later ages, and the uninformed reader could be left with a somewhat misleading impression. Perhaps also a little greater stress might have been placed upon the contribution made by Sicily and Magna Graecia, which recent archaeological discoveries are showing to be greater than had previously been realised, though the extent of its influence on the mainland of Greece is still a matter for debate.

Professor Webster has given us an admirable and scholarly introduction to the archaic Greek world, gracefully written and infused with that living humanism which we in this part of the world so greatly need if classical studies are not to wither and perish. It is encouraging to note that several of the illustrations have been taken from works in local collections and others are referred to in the very useful 'List of Monuments discussed in the Text' at the end of the book. The printing is a credit to the University of Otago Press, though it is a pity that current costs force the placing of footnotes at the end of chapters instead of at the bottom of the page—if this is inevitable, is it not easier for the reader to have them all together at the end rather than sandwiched in between the chapters? Two small corrections—the Nessos painter on p.44 rightly becomes the Nettos painter in the notes and list (nos. 40-42); on p.75 n.25 the reference to fig. 12 does not apply to no.60 but to no.55 in the following note.

Canberra

L. F. FITZHARDINGE
A. D. TRENDALL

POETS IN A LANDSCAPE. Gilbert Highet. *Pelican Books*, 1959. (First published by Hamish Hamilton, 1957).

Poets in a Landscape is the record of a trip to Italy, or rather of one object of that trip: to visit scenes associated with the lives and works of the Roman poets and describe accurately and sensitively their appearance today. The record consists of 48 plates illustrating a text of 240 pages. There is a chapter each for Catullus, Virgil, Propertius, Horace, Tibullus, and Ovid, plus a short chapter on Juvenal (whom Professor Highet made the object of a special study in 1951), and a final chapter on present-day Rome. Professor Highet tells us he was profoundly moved by much that he saw and experienced, and he has worked hard to interpret and communicate his feelings. Clearly he had in mind something wider than a scholarly audience, and the book's reappearance as a Pelican suggests its main purpose has remained that of an unusually informative guide-book rather than a work of literary interpretation. It would be churlish to receive the fruits of so conscientious a busman's holiday with ingratitude.

It must be admitted though that the character of the book seems to have altered in the writing. Understandably, Highet has wished to provide the common reader with some better knowledge of these half-dozen poets than the common reader nowadays is likely to possess. To meet this need honestly and vigorously, he has incorporated what at first sight look like a series of brief, but seriously-intended critical studies. They wear an air of authority, heightened by the addition of 30 pages of scholarly notes and index. This, and the weight a readable, recent book by a scholar of standing inevitably carries, compel us to ask: Has Highet any fresh critical contribution to make; or does he at any rate formulate consecrated opinions usefully and effectively?

Looked at in this light, the book is of unequal quality, and there are hints

that the holiday mood carried over into those parts which many might feel entitled to take as representing considered scholarly opinion. The chapter on Horace is the soundest. There is a certain exaggeration of light and shade: the bitterness and cruelty of the Satires and Epodes is overstressed, the tradition continued (with a prudishness curious today) of regarding Horace's early show of sexual rationalism as mere dirt. But there is enough good sense to render innocuous the occasional unsound statement (e.g. too much is made of the exceptional character of Horace's servile origin—see R. Syme, *Roman Revolution*, pp. 58, 196), the odd remark (e.g. p. 112: 'his eccentric career gave his mind many strange quirks which he himself found hard to manage'), or inadvertence of arrangement (on pp. 126-131 'five major virtues' of Horace's lyrics are discussed: the first, second and fifth are clearly labelled, but it is not clear where the third begins and hard to see at all what the fourth is.)

Of the rest, the chapter on Catullus is the longest and the weakest, despite some vigorous common sense: for example, Highet sees it is nonsense to make the Furius and Aurelius of Poem 16 really enemies of Catullus, though he does not explain how a poet whom he describes as 'passionately sincere' could possibly say

nam castum esse decet pium poetam
ipsum, uersiculos nihil necesse est

in reference to Poem 5. Either we are utterly mistaken about the integrity of Poem 5, or else these words, despite the apparent cross-reference, refer instead to pieces like Poem 99. Highet's analysis of Poem 8 on pp. 34-5 is good. He spots (p. 21) the clue to Poem 101—that it is a mixture of ritual words of greeting and farewell with passionate personal utterance. But these good things are woven into a fabric of biographical sentimentality which makes the reader who is anxious for sober evaluation feel uncomfortable.

On the strength of two passages where the classical allusions fall no thicker than they do in Horace (straightforward specimens of Propertius' ennobling reality by heroic comparison but dismissed as 'decoration'), Highet talks of 'cabalistic poetry' (p. 87). Passing on to stress Propertius' 'angularity of movement' (not exemplified) and justifying both these features by somewhat imprecise appeals to Eliot and Pound, he breaks off with a short paragraph of facile laudation ('fine poet', 'boldest and most original of the elegists'). Propertius is difficult, but Highet's explanations are too vague to be really enlightening, and the main point is missed—that the difficulty resides above all in Propertius' peculiar use of language.

To Tibullus he attributes a profundity that many will find as unexpected as the reference to 'grave psychical trouble' in this poet traditionally regarded as smooth-flowing and dreamy. Here is his summing-up of Tibullus (p. 168): 'To read the whole of his work, sixteen elegies, is to see a constant conflict in a soul too delicate to endure it. It is like watching Thomas Gray trying to write Baudelaire's *Flowers of Evil*'. There is, too a good deal of glib talk about the fundamentals of literature which strikes one as facile rather than false or insincere (e.g. the essay on style which begins the chapter on Tibullus).

The numerous translations have the great merit of fresh, clear language. Usually they fulfil their object very adequately, though their style is precarious—e.g. this opening couplet (p. 85) of Propertius I, 1:

Cynthia first enslaved me with her fatal eyes.

I had been uninfected by desire.

and there are some slips—e.g. the last hexameter on page 83 where Perugia is apparently described as a 'low-lying plain'.

Book Reviews

It must be emphasized that this is a holiday book. It must be remembered it is grossly unfair to expect a professor of Latin never to be provocative, certain of what others doubt, or unorthodox in his literary opinions. If the shortage of readable books on Roman poetry is so great that students will be apt to turn to *Poets in a Landscape* as though it were a textbook, the fault is not the author's. It makes it necessary, however, to assess the book's fitness to measure up to the responsibilities that may be thrust upon it.

University of Melbourne

KENNETH QUINN

DICKENS AND THE STRUCTURE OF THE NOVEL, E. A. Horsman. An Inaugural Lecture delivered before the University of Otago. *University of Otago Press*, Dunedin, 1959, pp. 11.

In this brief discussion of 'part of the critical theory of the novel', Professor Horsman claims that 'a proper criticism of Dickens needs to get behind "character", "atmosphere", or "plot" to the words themselves and see how the elements grouped by these common terms have their place in structures of greater importance to this particular novelist'. This defines his critical method and indicates his concern with the novelist's use of language, with verbal patterns and recurring 'sensory symbols', because these may reveal how the creative imagination has been involved in the theme, and hence determine the significant and vital structure of the novel.

During the last twenty-five years few literary critics of standing have failed to explore some aspect of 'expression structure', and methods that were first found rewarding in the analysis of certain kinds of poetry have provided more than marginal comments on prose fiction. Used with tact and discrimination this verbal approach can produce interesting results by indicating at least a few of the ways in which the creative imagination of a novelist like Dickens worked. Its danger lies in the tendency to place such emphasis on the importance of expression structure that it becomes the sole criterion for literary evaluation.

Professor Horsman makes some acute and illuminating remarks on the concrete language, the vivid words and images, used by Dickens to puncture the moral pretensions of characters who wallow in abstractions; and this ironical and verbal contrast he regards as the characteristic feature of the expression structure. The rest of his paper is devoted to structural aspects of two books, *Dombey and Son* and *Martin Chuzzlewit*, the first of which has, in his opinion, been over-praised, and the second undervalued.

He seeks to demonstrate that the sensory symbols associated with the bleak, cold-hearted world of Paul Dombey constitute a verbal pattern that emphasises and enlivens the compulsive theme of a child robbed of a mother's affection, but that the disintegration of this pattern and the failure to find verbal imagery to give meaning to later portions of the book leads to the conclusion that 'with the death of Paul the novel loses its centre'. Far from agreeing with Mrs Tillotson's opinion of the structure of *Dombey and Son*, Professor Horsman believes that a satisfying structure can be sensed only in the first sixteen chapters.

As an example of structural achievement he refers briefly to the successful use of a pattern of language referring to bodily appetites which he finds in *Martin Chuzzlewit*, a novel frequently condemned for its faulty structure. In the utterances of Mrs Gamp and in the drunken observations of Mr Pecksniff to Mrs Todgers he finds indications of the way in which Dickens

Book Reviews

creates a verbal structure which ironically reinforces his theme of the exploration of the self, the comedy of fleshly lusts underscoring the pretended pursuit of noble aims.

One can be grateful for the insights provided by Professor Horsman without being convinced that the last word has been said on the structural achievements and failures of these or other novels by Dickens. It would still seem possible to hold the opinion that *Martin Chuzzlewit* is a great novel marred by faulty construction, and that the first sixteen chapters of *Dombey and Son* do not constitute the novel Dickens wanted to write any more than they do the novel that even discriminating readers want to read.

University of Canterbury

H. WINSTON RHODES

G. K. CHESTERTON: A BIBLIOGRAPHY. John Sullivan. *University of London Press*, 1958, pp. 208.

A FULL-SCALE bibliographical study of G. K. Chesterton—is it necessary or desirable? Chesterton was not a major writer; he wrote no major work of undoubted genius. But it is nevertheless true that he was an important man of letters of his time. Between his first collection of 'rhymes and sketches' in 1900 and his death in 1936 he produced much of first rank in half-a-dozen varied minor genres: *Heretics* and *Orthodoxy*, 'Lepanto', some of the Father Brown stories, perhaps above all his vigorous polemical journalism. Apart from this, he is indeed impressive for what Mr Sullivan calls 'the sheer mass and variety' of his work. The weekly contributions over long periods to the *Daily News*, to *G. K.'s Weekly*, to the B.B.C. and *The Listener*, and, most persistently (some 1,535 essays), to *The Illustrated London News* are almost a life's work in themselves: he had that prolific abundance which makes so many writers seem sterile and inhibited.

Chesterton himself, looking back to the turn of the century, when he abandoned his art studies for writing, once said, 'I had discovered the easiest of all professions'. Perhaps this ease, this facility, betrayed him; but the surface competence, the intellectual agility, is seldom absent. The narrowness of his vision is usually obscured by the vigour and intelligence with which he expressed it, the quality which makes almost everything he wrote worth reading.

Mr Sullivan suggests that there has been 'little to guide the collector through the Chesterton maze', and this work undoubtedly will solve most problems for those whose main interest is to tell a first edition from a second. But the student who is interested more in what is inside the covers of G. K.'s books than in the title-page details does not fare so well. There is a picture of a page of the MS of 'Lepanto'—but no indication of where it was first published or in what book it is to be found; there are useful cross-references to show in which collected volumes random periodical essays first appeared, but only a brief list of subsequent 'Collections and Selections' with hardly any indication of what each contains. It is interesting to learn that G. K. has been translated into both Esperanto and Gaelic, but all except the most specialized collector would, I think, prefer to know where he can now find the sometimes unrecognized best of Chesterton. Mr Sullivan seems to have done the task he set himself with competence: I, in any case, can detect no errors or inconsistencies, and only one minor omission. But I cannot help feeling that the research which has gone into this volume could have been put to far better advantage if the compiler had

Book Reviews

selected the best of G. K.'s fugitive essays and reviews and put them between covers. There is too little Chesterton in print; there are too many bibliographies which, unlike, say, Keynes's and Chapman's works on Jane Austen, have little substantial value.

University of Melbourne

HUME DOW

TULANE STUDIES IN ENGLISH, Volume VIII. Edited by Aline Taylor. Tulane University, New Orleans, 1958, pp.192.

There is little of either linguistic or critical interest in most of these seven essays. All but two or three give the impression of diligent spade-work, possibly useful as raw material to an imaginative scholar but, as they stand, no more than that—the kind of collection which encourages me to share Miss Helen Gardner's lack of confidence in 'any critic who does not make me feel, however minute his analysis, and however laborious his researches may have been, that his motive force has been enjoyment'. The motive force here is too patently the American academic imprecation, 'Publish or be damned'.

Two of the longer essays are primarily historical studies with only accidental literary interest. One, a study by Dick Taylor, Jr., of the Earl of Pembroke's connections with Jacobean court entertainments which 'placed him at the heart of the burgeoning of the masque', displays great industry in sifting primary and secondary sources. The author has an eye for piquant detail in his documents, but his proofs and suppositions throw little light on Jonson and thus have only the most specialized interest. The other, a competent piece of detective work by the editor, Mrs Aline Taylor, discusses 'The Patrimony of James Quin', the 18th century actor and *bon-vivant*, whose more colourful side unfortunately plays no part in her largely legal argument.

R. P. Adams' discussion of Hawthorne's 'Old Manse Period' is largely an extended account of marginalia, with a tendency to force details into fixed categories (or a card-index). However, some observations about Hawthorne's complex imagery are of critical interest and could be suggestive to students of the novelist's better work. R. M. Lumiansky's study of the role of Sir Bors in Malory's *Morte D'arthur* is painstakingly detailed and appears—oh lucky find!—to be on a subject not previously discussed. R. H. Fogle's brief note on critical issues raised by Melville's *Billy Budd*, intelligent and provocative, is perhaps of more general interest.

The two contributions which should have the widest appeal, however, are T. J. Assad's 'practical criticism' approach to Tennyson's 'Crossing the Bar', which, though unevenly written, is a convincing analysis, and E. P. Bollier's 'T. S. Eliot and John Milton: A Problem in Criticism'. Mr Bollier approaches his subject—the supposed 'recantation' of Eliot's adverse view of Milton—with vigour and intelligence. He puts Eliot's criticism into the perspective of Eliot as poet-critic and thus, while showing its limitations, gives us a coherent, positive view of its value. Mr Bollier argues convincingly that Eliot has been basically consistent in his view of Milton, that he has at all times regarded Milton as a major poet. He sees Eliot's earlier strictures as mainly concerned with Milton's possibly deleterious effects on later poetry, both 18th and 20th century, and suggests that Eliot's apparent change of front ('what has changed is not so much Eliot's views as his feelings') has been a change in 'Eliot's estimate of the direction contemporary poetry should take'. Though Mr Bollier does not keep his argument sharply in focus at

Book Reviews

all points, his essay succeeds in relating his thesis to general questions of the writing of criticism by creative writers, questions of some interest to all students of literature.

University of Melbourne

HUME DOW

A CONCISE SURVEY OF FRENCH LITERATURE. Germaine Mason. London, Arthur Barker, 1959, pp. 344.

THIS book is intended primarily for the general public and for students making their first contact with French literature. Germaine Mason has therefore been confronted with the problem faced by all writers of general surveys, namely that of making the best use of the limited amount of space available. Unfortunately, she has not always managed to do this. As a result, there is a certain air of superficiality about her book that is not evident in the other two most recent surveys of French literature written in English: Brereton's *Short History of French Literature* (London 1954) and Cazamian's *History of French Literature* (Oxford 1955).

For example, in discussing the *Chanson de Roland*, Mme Mason is content to relate the plot (p. 16), whereas Cazamian, using only a few more words, succeeds in at least touching on the many qualities that help to make this work one of the milestones in French literature. Brereton does likewise, but to a lesser degree.

Similarly, in the section devoted to the *Roman de la Rose*, Mme Mason states that the first part of the poem 'can be interpreted as a *courtois* code of love representing the stages through which the course of true love must pass before the lover wins the heart of his lady (p. 20)'. The second part is used by Jean de Meung 'as a frame for his criticisms against the society of the time, the egoism of the aristocracy, the hypocrisy of the monks, and social injustices. His conception of love is also very different from the *amour courtois* as the author despises women and sees in love nothing more than a law of nature. He appears as a rationalist well ahead of his time, and his work, though pedantic in parts, is, by its sober and vigorous style, an indication of progress towards a classical ideal in literature (p. 21)'. Brereton, using fewer words, nevertheless brings out more clearly the importance of this work: 'The composite *Roman de la Rose* may lack artistic unity, but it contains nearly all the features which interested the mediaeval mind'; and Cazamian, using almost the same words as Mme Mason was later to use, also situates Jean de Meung more precisely in the history of French literature: 'This robust and sincere writer, compact of rationality and sense, is a major figure in the early development of French thought; through the neatness of his firm, coherent style and the sober force of his line he strikes us as one more token of the instinctive trend towards a classical ideal in literature.'

The examples could be multiplied to include such writers as Marot, Montaigne and, closer to us, Baudelaire, Rimbaud and in particular Mallarmé, whose work is summed up as follows: 'His poetry is not descriptive nor is it intellectual. Instead of naming an object, he wanted to give the reader the impression, or the desire, of its presence; or the sense of vacuum caused by its absence. In searching for the essence of things, he often reached a void or chaos, hence the frequent reappearance, in his vocabulary, of such words as absence, emptiness, inanity (p. 228).' On the other hand, La Fontaine, Racine and Voltaire are well treated. This is all the more

Book Reviews

meritorious in that they are difficult writers to compress into a few paragraphs for a general history of literature.

Another criticism that might be made of this book is that the nineteenth century receives more than its fair share of space (80 pages, compared with 52 devoted to the eighteenth century, 44 to the seventeenth, 28 to the sixteenth and 23 to the mediaeval period). However, Mme Mason defends her preference in these words: 'The nineteenth century was one of the richest and most dynamic periods in French literature, and the most remarkable for its diversity. It has often been belittled by the admirers of the classical age. But one cannot fail to be impressed by the succession of conflicting tendencies, of different literary schools, by the renewed attempts to find an aesthetic expression corresponding to the rapidly changing values of the time' (p. 240).

One might also regret that, in a work intended partly for the general public, more space is not devoted to the contemporary period, with some attempt at classification, at least in the novel. It is true that the twentieth century fares better than even the seventeenth from the point of view of space, but in attempting to mention too many names Mme Mason at times produces a catalogue effect. This is particularly noticeable in the section devoted to the post-war novel, where the author offers us 'a miscellaneous selection of books which have met with special success and which provide enjoyable reading (p. 298)'. Thus we find grouped together in the one paragraph such writers as Pierre Boulle, Roger Peyrefitte, Hervé Bazin and Françoise Sagan.

One final criticism that might be made of this book is that its division into 'centuries' is a fairly conventional one. No mention is made of the notion of 'literary generations' now favoured by most French literary historians. On the other hand, it must be said that it is more up-to-date than the other two mentioned, in that such 'fashionable' subjects as the Baroque receive due attention.

Mme Mason's book is also a more readable work than the other two in question. The style is easy and often racy, and there are occasional personal touches added to the narrative, such as this comment on Montaigne: 'Nor has he aged even to-day. In hours of disappointment, or dejection, it is still a comfort to turn to him. The *Essays* are an ideal bedside book (p. 47).'

The bibliography is full and well chosen, and includes the latest works of reference. A useful analytical index is also provided. In short, in spite of the defects mentioned earlier, Mme Mason's *Survey* would prove a useful and eminently readable introductory work for students in the lower years and for Extension Board and Adult Education classes, as well as for the general reader anxious to obtain a concise, over-all picture of French literature from its beginnings to the present day.

University of Sydney

K. J. GOESCH

THE HARRAP ANTHOLOGY OF FRENCH POETRY. Edited by Joseph Chiari. London, Harrap, 1958, pp. 515.

THE reader of this anthology is struck first and foremost by the generosity of the choice. Ranging over the whole field of French poetry from the Middle Ages to the present day, Dr Chiari includes more than four hundred titles that represent close on ninety authors. In some cases only a fragment of the poem is reproduced—a fact unfortunately not indicated in the table

Book Reviews

of contents; but the diversity, the richness of these 400 odd pages of clearly printed texts is something for which one is indeed grateful. Moreover many of the selections take us away from the beaten track of so many previous anthologies. Thus it is with real pleasure that we find several of the minor sixteenth century poets well represented; another variation on general practice is the choice of extracts from the plays of Robert Garnier, Corneille, Racine and Paul Claudel. It will be seen then that, while he stops short of the prose-poetry of Rimbaud, Lautréamont, Michaux and Char, Dr Chiari shows a nearly catholic taste; yet one comes across very few poems in his book about whose worth there can be any doubt. (We have scarcely the space to discuss textual details; suffice it to note that the anthology contains one or two questionable readings, such as that of St. 9 and 12 of Rimbaud's *Le Bateau ivre* where Dr Chiari's punctuation does not conform to any of the recognized French editions).

'The introduction', says the publisher's note, 'contains a highly individual study of the development of French poetry.' In this section, more surely than in the choice of poems, the editor's personal touch is apparent. He has divided his fifty-page essay into four parts comprising brief notes on 'the French language as a medium for poetry', its prosody, 'the main traits of French literature', and a longer historical survey ('the pattern') of French poetry. Highly individual it all is; and, however laudable the anthology, one perhaps hesitates to recommend the introduction unreservedly to 'the general reader as well as the student of French in universities and schools' for whom it is intended. Some comments, for instance, are disarmingly naïve: thus Dr Chiari can write, without the trace of a smile, that 'the French language is a precise instrument, and even philosophy can be clearly expounded in it' (p. 32); or pedestrian; 'Molière is the most outstanding universal genius which France has produced. The *genre* in which he worked—comedy . . . ' (p. 50). On the other hand, he can put forward remarks of highly dubious value (for example, 'the French are, by and large, a Gaelic people and like all Gaels—Scots, Irish or Welsh—they love perfectly worked out conventions and patterns' (p. 33)—especially when we have just been told (p. 31) that 'the Frenchman is eloquent, he is the Greek of modern times'). Moreover, Dr Chiari is never happier than when using a highly ornate language in which metaphor remorselessly follows metaphor. 'Let Victor Hugo be described', he says, 'not as a golden-feathered Ganymedeian eagle hovering steadily in the azure sky and pouring forth heavenly music, but rather as a kind of winged chimera which can fly as high as any eagle, sing siren-songs, and also crawl on the earth midst repellent roars . . . ' In keeping with these Victorian tones, Villon, we are told, 'performed upon the *ballade* Christ's miracle upon Lazarus', George Sand is given her due—'that mantis', while Rimbaud 'used up, in a few years, his meed of divine essence'. I am afraid that such a style is likely to annoy and embarrass most present-day readers.

But, after all, English is not Dr Chiari's native language, and he may be excused some of these graceless turns of phrase. What is clear is that, supported by statements of T. S. Eliot (quoted on numerous occasions for his 'customary wisdom'), and warning against his *bête noire*, Thierry Maulnier, he is anxious to revise some poetic reputations. A few of the points he makes concern what he takes to be the undeserved neglect into which Garnier's work has fallen ('among the best lyrics of French poetry'), the overrating of Malherbe ('whose only genius was patience and self-assurance'), the thinness of Corneille, the superficiality of the Romantics ('French Romantic poets took only the husk of things, while they remained unaware of the core'). Are

Book Reviews

we able to deduce the editor's own criterion of poetry? For him poetry, to be great, must possess 'religious depth', the depth, he says, of Villon, Ronsard ('a firm Catholic freed from the medieval fears of hell'), Racine, the Hugo of *Dieu* and *La Fin de Satan*; and this is precisely the depth he finds missing in Corneille. Dr Chiari concludes his introduction on a typical note, not by a critical observation, nor an argument, but a personal expression of religious faith: 'The greater the poet, the nearer he is to the centre and source of all things, and therefore the wider the segment of human life which he illuminates; but only the Creator who is at the centre can illuminate the whole.'

University of Melbourne

J. R. LAWLER

MALLARME ET LE DRAME SOLAIRE. Gardner Davies. *Paris, Corti*, 1959, pp. 300.

Mallarmé pictured the earth as being, after sunset, plunged into night. Poetically, that is of course legitimate, though cosmologically it is a mistake: the earth is always illuminated, swimming in the perpetual light of the cosmos, though it turns one face at a time away from the sun, so that the stars become visible in the ensuing penumbra.

Similarly, he imagines the sun as being swallowed up by darkness when it sets, and waiting in an agony of incertitude for its own resurrection. Again, he is poetically justified in assuming that the night engulfs the sun: poets have from time immemorial made the same assumption (e.g. Coleridge: 'The sun's rim dips, the stars rush out').

Grosso modo, this agony of the sun is the drama to which many of Mallarmé's best poems are devoted, and which Dr Davies here examines with scrupulous ingenuity; and he finds for it a strikingly original *dénouement*.

This is the most ambitious of his books to date, and one that calls for high praise and grateful attentiveness, whether one agrees or not with all the author's exegetical findings and constructive generalisations. I think he is justified when he states on his opening page that the drama of sunset is the most patent symbol of the aesthetic problems partially set forth in *Igitur*, the *Coup de dés* and the unfinished *Noces d'Hérodiade* (he recently published the text of the latter, with a precious collection of variants: Gallimard, 1959).

Briefly (though brevity is here a mutilation), Dr Davies' thesis is as follows: When darkness absorbs the sun, nothing remains but 'une réminiscence purifiée par le feu de ses éléments matériels'. And the problem to which Mallarmé devotes his poetic efforts is that of recreating *intellectually* the sun's vanished glory (see p. 38). He absorbs its essence into his own mind, as it were, and keeps it intact, so that its resurrection may be assured. (It is interesting, though perhaps a trifle frivolous, to reflect that Rostand's Chantecler is Mallarmé's unwitting parodist in this respect).

To do this, he has to purge himself of all that is personal; advance towards a complete and impersonal abstraction; and in *Igitur* and the *Coup de dés* this progressive effort is sketched out. It is, as Dr Davies sees it, an effort intended ultimately to produce that 'Grand Oeuvre' which the poet did not live long enough to write. I add that, obviously, this ideal of artistic impersonality corresponds to the immateriality attained by the sun after it has set.

To establish his thesis, Dr Davies naturally works out exegeses of the Mallarmean poems that are specifically related to the drama of sunset, including (perhaps a little surprisingly, but not at all illogically) *Surgi de la*

Book Reviews

croupe et du bond; and he seeks to confirm his interpretations by reference to many of Mallarmé's prose writings as well as to other poems. His method is sound and imaginative, and his exegeses, always interesting, are often illuminating (notably, to my mind, in the case of *Quand l'ombre menaça*). With some of them I disagree in part, inevitably, for there is a subjective element, in both the enjoyment and the interpretation of poetry, that cannot but lead to divergences.

For example, in his discussion of *La chevelure vol d'une flamme*, with regard to the verses:

. . . la femme
Accomplit par son chef fulgurante l'exploit
De semer de rubis le doute qu'elle écorche,

Dr Davies explains 'rubis' by saying (p. 183) 'C'est comme si elle l'écorchait au point d'en faire jaillir des gouttes de sang'; adding that Mallarmé transforms this 'image . . . audacieuse' into 'des rubis qui viennent orner le doigt privé de bagues', and then transforms 'le doigt orné de rubis' into a torch. But it is by her *head* that the woman sprinkles doubt with rubies: the text makes that inescapable. As I see it, Mallarmé is thinking exclusively of the woman's hair, not of her hands. Her hair, catching the glow of the evening sun, is like a flaming torch, throwing out coruscations as she moves it, just as a swung torch scatters red sparks.

But such divergences of opinion do not alter my admiration for this stimulating thesis; and rather than go further into details of disagreement, I conclude by saying that Dr Davies' study opens up some most fascinating avenues of speculation: and that is one of the greatest tributes that one can pay to any book. It has set me wondering, above all, whether the 'Grand Oeuvre' was intended to be a sort of *ars poetica* transcending all 'practical' questions of technique, and showing the way towards a perfect impersonality of art; towards an artistic and intellectual Nirvana which would be art's supreme *correspondance*; towards an absolute of genius which is perhaps already suggested in a line of the *Coup de dés*:

l'ultérieur démon immémorial.

London

A. R. CHISHOLM

GOETHE'S MAJOR PLAYS. Ronald Peacock, *Manchester University Press*, 1959, pp. ix + 236.

MANY years ago the brilliantly aggressive Josef Nadler prefaced his *Berliner Romantik* with a more than usually contumacious *Vorschuss an meine Scherbenrichter*. In the course of a dazzling display of polemical fireworks he annihilated, for all time one would have thought, the carping specialist reviewer who draws his material from the foreword of the book about to be dragged to the wall. This awful warning came to mind in a rather unusual way while reading Professor Peacock's Introduction to his highly interesting and entertaining book. For he raises so many shrewd and fascinating points concerning the nature of drama and Goethe's unorthodox variations on it that one was tempted to devote this review to a discussion of the Introduction alone. Fortunately Nadler's admonition prevailed. One says 'fortunately' because further reading showed this to be a beautifully planned work in which the author proceeds from those general considerations outlined at the

beginning through five chapters of commentary on the plays chosen, to a conclusion in which the general features of Goethe's dramatic art are discussed. In this closing chapter various ideas which were put forward at the outset are taken up again. In between, however, lie the detailed illustration and modification found to be necessary as the author pursues his chosen line of progress. Professor Peacock's chosen line is to take plays which are complete and which have had a career, 'even if a chequered one', on the stage. His selected team, therefore discussed in the five chapters mentioned, is *Götz: Clavigo, Stella and Egmont; Iphigenie; Tasso; Faust I*.

In taking this course the author has simplified his task and ours in following him. More important than this, however, is the fact that in choosing 'live' dramas he has pointedly dispensed with the weight of metaphysical and other speculation which so often bears down crushingly on Goethe as a playwright. *Faust I*, he says, 'is more accessible and enjoyable if one takes Goethe at his word when he says it arises from 'a somewhat obscure emotional condition of the individual', instead of labouring metaphysical arguments and quasi-theological distinctions Goethe's best plays are very great works, but they do not belong to the formally perfect works of art; and scholars and critics have for far too long endeavoured, out of reverence for the idea of Goethe's genius, to prove artistic unity and coherence at all costs.'

Professor Peacock demonstrates that Goethe the dramatist does not create a 'world' or social picture in the way made familiar by Shakespeare, Ibsen or Chekov. He had little interest in political action or historical depiction, and in consequence little ability when it came to creating objectively seen characters and actions. In effect, says Peacock, his plays are extended depictions of himself and his problems as he came to terms with the external world. But because his own character and range of problem were richly diverse and complex, he was able to create a gallery of memorable individuals. He is, we are told, 'a master of dramatic-theatrical presentation *by episodes*. The play limps, but the individual person and the individual scenes are tense and alive.'

It is at this point, however, that a regret arises. In laying aside the theoretical speculation noted above and in concentrating so explicitly on the stage plays, Professor Peacock raised hopes that he was also intending to discuss the plays as actual stage pieces. His interest in the theatre, shown elsewhere in his *Poet in the Theatre* and in *The Art of Drama*, led one to hope for a compelling analysis of the sheer stage-effectiveness of these dramas. As it is he takes us to the brink and more than hints that he is well aware, in *Faust I* and *Egmont* for instance, of how 'the strength of dramatic scenes is greatly enhanced by a cumulative succession with pace and intensity increasing until the catastrophe is reached'. But then he draws back. We are told from time to time that Goethe's dramatic characters are 'given an initial impulse to stage life' or that they are in fact 'theatrically alive'. But the author might perhaps have supported these quite unassailable contentions with demonstrations of the *Bühnenwirksamkeit* of these characters: of, for example, the tragic irony achieved by the structural similarity of the Oranien and Alba scenes in *Egmont*, or of the sense of gathering disaster reflected in the poetic and rhythmic overtones of Gretchen's songs, and the manner in which for each song Goethe has created a setting which is poetically compelling and humanly as well as dramatically credible.

It can be argued that these things are not within the author's plan. But the emphasis on the plays as stage dramas leads one to expect at least an excursion in the direction indicated. Professor Peacock does indeed refer more than once to Goethe's enthusiasm for the practical theatre, and to the fact that Schiller had a "lustrier" sense for what constituted strong drama. We are told, more-

over, that Goethe's themes and characters could not be imagined in other than dramatic form. That uniquely unorthodox form is brilliantly analysed in its various modifications. The haunting secret of why this form is in spite of everything so effective dramatically is not really treated. It is scarcely sufficient to say of such scenes as that between Ferdinand and Egmont, or Gretchen at the spinning wheel, that they are "vivid as dramatic meetings or as genre pictures. . . . One has the impression that Goethe is quite contented with the sheer pictorial or lyrico-dramatic quality of such scenes. Yet they usually have a place in the story, however loosely the latter is constructed, and so they contain at least some elements of dramatic suspense or relatedness."

A discussion of Goethe's dramatic effectiveness would be particularly valuable to the British or American reader. Goethe's dramas are not, and are at present unlikely to become part of, the regular stage repertory in Anglo-Saxon countries. Opportunities of actually *experiencing* them are in consequence rare.

One would not wish, however, to close these reflections in any negative way. The book abounds in original and sometimes memorable insights and aperçus. Whether Professor Peacock is demonstrating the connection between the finished *Faust I* and romantic thought from Rousseau onwards or whether he is delineating the variations in Goethe's 'portrait' technique, he is persuasive and enthusiastic but always tempered by discriminating restraint. It is indeed likely that the book will fulfil its author's hope of appealing to the student as an effective introduction to the most familiar plays of Goethe, while at the same time offering original and stimulating points of discussion to those who are more familiar with the canon of Goethian criticism.

University of New England

BRIAN COGLAN

SCHILLER: LEBEN UND WERK. Bernt von Heiseler, *Gütersloh, Bertelsmann Verlag*, 1955, pp. 220 + 16 pages with 53 pictures.

It is in no cynical spirit that one notes two seemingly characteristic features of the post-war German scene: festivals to mark or celebrate this phenomenon or that artist, and—often closely connected—centenaries, sesquicentenaries, 'Vierhundertjahrfeier', etc. There have obviously always been anniversaries: what is probably new is the great concentration on them, the tendency on the one hand to look back nostalgically to a great (or apparently comfortable and secure) past, and on the other to brood publicly on X's 'Wirkung in die Gegenwart' or Y's 'Sendung im zwanzigsten Jahrhundert' . . .

Schiller, the bicentenary of whose birth is being celebrated this year, offers many chances in this respect: 'national' dramatist, philosopher of freedom, shining example of heroism triumphing over physical suffering, *Kulturpolitiker* (Hofmannsthal's 'beredete . . . bewusste Herold seiner Epoche'), honorary citizen of the French Republic.—Themes for eloquent occasional addresses come tripping lightly off the pen. As always there is the danger of losing sight of the man and artist himself amidst the plethora of his many 'special' significances. One recalls how in the Goethe year of 1949 we were treated to Goethe's place in almost every field from vivisectionism to the Great Reform Bill and what he *would* have said about it. In the process one sometimes forgot that he was after all the creator of *Faust* and *Selige Sehnsucht*.

It is one of the many virtues of the present book that it never loses sight of Schiller as, in Gurnemanz's phrase, 'ein Mensch wie alle':—and yet, of

course, not quite like all men. Heiseler himself is very well qualified to write this book. Those who have followed his quiet yet distinguished career over the years esteem him as a writer of incorruptible principle, whose style is possessed of an easy grace and felicity of phrase which never become facile or consciously 'literary'. He is active in many fields: as novelist, lyric poet, dramatist, as a very heartfelt *Kulturpolitiker*, and as critical commentator on both his contemporaries and his preceptors. In this he continues a tradition of poet-critics which includes such names as Lessing, Schiller himself, Friedrich Schlegel, Eichendorff, Heine and Hebbel. In more recent times the tradition has been carried on with particular distinction by, for example, Thomas Mann and Hofmannsthal. A study of Heiseler's *Ahnung und Aussage* (1952), a collection of critical essays on figures and genres, ranging from Goethe's sorrow on the death of Schiller to a considered rejection of Ernst Jünger, leads one to expect great things of his Schiller biography. And one is not disappointed.

This is not a learned work in the sense that Heiseler does not bring up the heavy artillery of academic apparatus and critical comparison of his own with other viewpoints. His standpoint is indicated when he cites Goethe's comment to Schiller:

'Lassen Sie mich erinnern, was sich gewissermassen von selbst versteht: dass hier nicht die Rede sei, neue und unbekannte oder unerhörte Dinge zu sagen, sondern das Bekannte, das längst Ausgeübte so darzustellen, wie es sich in unsrer Gemütsart sammelt.'

What Heiseler attempts is in effect a Schiller *Volkshuch*. He is clearly troubled by the gaping clefts and contradictions in modern German history which have made any kind of organic cultural continuity so difficult. Right at the beginning he sets his face against the repeated tendency to cry 'tabula rasa':

'Wir sehen viele unsrer Mitlebenden sich anklammern an die Gegenwart, die ihnen nicht mehr eine heilig wahrzunehmende Aufgabe zwischen Vergangenheit und Zukunft ist, sondern bloss eine flüchtige Wohnlichkeit, über die sie nicht hinausdenken wollen; das möchte gern für Vitalität genommen werden, sich auslebend im vollen Augenblick, aber es äussert sich mit zu gespanntem Eifer, um wirklich dafür gelten zu können.'

The moral purpose of Heiseler's book becomes clear when he mourns the loss of contact between this contemporary age and the spirit of German Classicism,—

... 'die letzte grosse Form, in der unser Wesen sich ausprägte; in der Romantik erschien es ungeformt, nur mehr als Ruf und Bewegung, und was nachher kam, ist für die Welt nicht mehr als Geist sprechend geworden und ebendarum rätselhaft und befremdlich geblieben.'

This purpose alone and carried out unadorned in stern if high-minded moralizing tone would offer a bleak prospect. It is here, however, that Heiseler the experienced dramatic craftsman and delicate poet more than saves the day. The actual narrative, and especially the commentaries on individual dramas, abound in the kind of sentient appreciation—and clear, evocative exposition of it—which is the peculiar talent of the artist-critic. (That is not to say that an artist-critic always makes such pure-minded or disinterested use of his ability to see behind the creative scenes!) One has so often heard the guiding tenet of Schillerian dramatic criticism:—Schiller was above all a man of the theatre, on the stage his sheer theatrical effectiveness carries all before it, etc. This is not to be disputed for one moment. But

rarely is Schiller's specific theatricality conveyed in cold print in such an evocative yet reasoned manner as here. Heiseler's commentary on *Wallenstein*, for example, does this with startlingly fresh actuality in which the sensitivity of the poetic artist and craftsman is at once felt:

'. . . Und ich weiss nicht, wie man überhaupt, wenn man für den Austrag menschlicher Konflikte in der Sprach-und Handlungsgestalt des Dramas empfänglich ist, ander als mit der tiefsten Bewegung die Boten, die Reiter sehen kann, die Wallensteins Entscheidung zum Feind tragen, auf langer Strasse dahineilen. Ein über das Fünfmass verlängerter Jambus gibt unvergesslich das Bild:

'Es ist zu spät, Indes du deine Worte
Verlierst, wird schon ein Meilenzeiger nach dem andern
Zurückgelegt von meinen Eilenden,
Die mein Gebot nach Prag und Eger tragen . . .'

Heiseler is, however, never uncritically affirmative about his subject. He takes issue with Schiller, for example, at the point where he sees the latter's noble and all-transfiguring idealism parting company from 'truth'. His brief but meaningful discussion of this in connection with Tell's murder of Gessler (p.201-2) is particularly interesting; likewise his critical but also moderate and frequently positive remarks on the ethical and moral basis of the *Briefe über die ästhetische Erziehung des Menschen* (p.165ff).

All in all then, this is a very rewarding book. It seeks to portray Schiller with vigour and sympathy and it demonstrates feeling and intuitive understanding characteristic of its author, an artist who always reveals in his work a clearly marked if quietly expressed moral fervour. Finally, with the anxieties, half-truths and invitations to moral sloth of the present age constantly in mind, Heiseler attempts, successfully one would like to believe, to bring Germany's 'national' dramatist closer than ever to an unusually wide audience.

University of New England

BRIAN COGHLAN

A HISTORY OF GERMAN LITERATURE: J. G. Robertson. Third edition, revised and enlarged by Edna Purdie with the assistance of W. I. Lucas and M. O'C. Walshe. *Edinburgh, William Blackwood & Sons, 1959.* pp. xvi + 700.

THE composer of a history of literature inevitably stumbles on many problems. Increasing knowledge, variety of opinion and changing historical perspectives must all mean greater length. The literature of our own age imperiously demands consideration. At the same time utility and the needs of the student for whom the work is written insist that it be kept within bearable lengths. Then comes conscience: how to generalise without giving wrong impressions, how to avoid detail without offending the specialist. Finally it is doubtful whether many scholars nowadays feel capable of attacking the *massif central* of a nation's entire literature with the same sovereign ease and critical élan shown by the great liberal scholars of half a century and more ago. Mid-century complexities, the shifting foundations of society and its views since 1918 (and more so since 1945) make the task difficult and forbidding.

A few brave souls are willing and, like the vastly successful Fritz Martini, well able to plunge in and swim the entire course without undue loss of

critical breath. There is, however, also a tendency towards what might be called the *Sammelwerk*. In this various leading scholars combine, each contributing a long essay on a selected theme. Immediately one might scent over-specialisation. The conclusion then would be that such a work cannot satisfy the student's general needs. In reality this need not be so. Various works seem to prove this, good examples being *Deutsche Literatur im Zwanzigsten Jahrhundert* (edited by Hermann Friedmann and Otto Mann) and *Das Deutsche Drama* (edited by Benno von Wiese). The assembled experts treat their special theme or work, but out of the fulness of a well-stocked and finely cultivated mind. The result is often all manner of fruitful overlapping and mutual complementing. In the final assessment one frequently gets a splendid and varied view of the mosaic of a literature, a period, or a specific genre.

This method was far from the thoughts of J. G. Robertson when he assembled his famous history early in the century. One wonders, however, if his present editor and reviser did not unconsciously feel the need for some comparable arrangement when she invited her two collaborators to take part, one at each end of the chronological scale.

Nothing can of course dim the splendour of Professor Robertson's achievement, which in many ways transformed the face of British *Germanistik* and placed it forever in his debt. No less remarkable has been the succession of scholars and teachers, of whom Professor Purdie herself is doubtless one of the most distinguished, which was taught and guided by him. But one cannot help wondering whether better service might not have been done to the spirit of Robertson had various of his former pupils and divers sympathetic colleagues collaborated in a *Sammelwerk*. For revision is a complex affair: how independent may the reviser be when re-casting a chapter 'in the light of more recent knowledge'? To what extent is his own style of writing cramped and confined by an effort to conform to that of the original?

The issue is not and cannot be clear-cut. Professor Purdie says: 'If the substance remains the same, the significance may nevertheless be differently interpreted.' One is on the horns of a dilemma: the lasting value of much of Robertson's work may demand inclusion in a modern 'revision', but where does the process of revision stop? Are we to expect a fourth and a fifth revised edition as the years pass? At what point will 'Robertson' be submerged by 'revision'? Or do we perhaps need a completely fresh work for which Robertson is a major inspiration? Is the revision the product of respect and *Pietätsgefühl* which are understandable and even praiseworthy, but which may also be a trifle exaggerated in this public and permanent form?

These worrying reflections being voiced, however, there is much to praise. The combination of Robertson with Professor Purdie would ensure this in any case. The huge work unrolls its length with the same effortless and urbane ease as previously. A reviewer can clearly not claim the ability to judge all parts with equal acumen. Nevertheless it is clear that the many additions and modifications—and telling deletions—realize Professor Purdie's avowed (if debatable) aim while not departing from the spirit of Robertson's first two editions.

Some queries do arise. Professor Purdie observes in her preface that our view of German literature has been deeply affected by the general movement of literary criticism. This being so, it might be thought strange that various sections on figures and works notably subject to re-evaluation have been printed with remarkably little change. Grimmelshausen, Wieland, Herder, *Faust II* and Fontane are all examples of this. There are some sig-

nificant deletions and changes of emphasis in the account of Hölderlin, but he still fares very badly when compared with the neighbouring Jean-Paul. This would be hard to justify these days. One is also disappointed, despite a very representative bibliography, to note no change in the account given of J. C. Günther. The treatment given to Raabe is really very inadequate: *Stopfkuchen* and *Pfisters Mühle* are not even mentioned, neither is his attitude to the new Reich after 1871. Gotthelf is dismissed in half a page. The sections on Grillparzer, Nestroy and Raimund remain little changed despite the much greater knowledge which we now have of the development of the Viennese theatre.

These must serve as examples. Very much on the credit side is the section of the work which has, one imagines, been awaited most keenly: Professor Lucas' revision and extension of the final phases of the work. His summaries of the development and significance of such major figures as Thomas Mann, Ricarda Huch or Hofmannsthal are tersely expressed but every word counts, and we get a series of neatly rounded pictures as a result. In similar effective manner he rescues Hesse from the obscurity and triviality to which Robertson had assigned him. Superficiality does indeed begin to creep in when Professor Lucas comes down to the present time. He certainly sums up such things as contemporary tendencies in lyric poetry with convincing clarity. But it is strange that such a figure as Krolow should be given a mere mention and that Celan, widely thought to be one of the two or three most significant talents at work in Germany today, is nowhere listed. Musil and his vast novel are disposed of in four severely factual lines, while Doderer is quite absent from the index. These two facts indicate perhaps the tendency to regard *Austriazismus* as something provincial and tributary to the main German stream. In these two cases at least, a goodly proportion of contemporary opinion would not agree. It certainly seems odd to exclude or pass over such things and yet to end the chapter with a note on *Draussen vor der Tür*, a sensational work in its time but of doubtful staying power, to say the least. It seems that Professor Lucas is much at home with the more orthodox figures such as Schröder and Gertrud von Le Fort, both of whom, one is glad to note, are given full credit for their great but unsensational achievements. Bergengruen is another who is discerningly discussed and who emerges in his full stature. But such a fascinating and baffling 'conservative revolutionary' as Rudolf Borchardt is omitted.

The revised history leaves one with a curious impression. Of Robertson's lasting stature there was never any doubt. There can be little discussion as to the proven ability of the three revisers. But the nature of their self-appointed task is of a restrictive kind which often means that they are unable to give us of their best. The book as it now stands cannot fail to be very useful. Whether the energies consumed in its revision could have been better used is, however, at the very least an open question.

University of New England

BRIAN COGHLAN

ZEHN JAHRE EXIL. BRIEFE AUS NEUSEELAND 1938-1948. KARL WOLFSKEHL. herausgegeben und eingeleitet von Margot Ruben mit ein Nachwort von Fritz Usinger. Verlag Lambert Schneider, Heidelberg/Darmstadt, 1959, pp. 429.

In this, the thirteenth publication of the Deutsche Akademie für Sprache und Dichtung, Dr Margot Ruben, Wolfskehl's secretary and friend during

the blind poet's years of exile, has made available some 245 letters which Wolfskehl composed during the ten years he spent in self-chosen exile 'auf Erdballs letztem Inselriff'.

In 1938, Karl Wolfskehl, 'ein antiker Mensch, ein mediterraner Mensch'—as Dr Ruben calls him in her preface—turned his back on all that he held most dear and emigrated to New Zealand. Why, of all places, New Zealand? Wolfskehl had many other friends—friends near to himself in aims and interests—who had also been forced to flee the 'grosster sumpf' of Nazidom which had taken over and desecrated many of the ideas nurtured by the George-Kries and turned the Hakenkreuz (itself a proud symbol of the Acropolis) into 'ein Symbol der Vernichtung'. Most of these friends had gone to the U.S.A., South America, Israel—even to Yugoslavia, Switzerland and England. To Wolfskehl however nowhere could now be far enough away from the Germany he had loved. He saw in himself the figure of Job, and with Job's humility he took upon himself the 'ewiger Fug des Judenschicksals'. Before he came to New Zealand, the already sixty-nine year old poet knew little or nothing of the land or of its people, but chose this country as his point of exile because of its distance from Europe. In choosing New Zealand, the poet chose almost complete spiritual solitude. Here, the particular highly-cultured *Geisteraum* of his beloved Munich was completely non-existent. Indeed, for a New Zealander, such a world would have been as incomprehensible as his new surroundings were for Wolfskehl. To the average New Zealander, the Schwabinger Kulturkreise would be ludicrous, artificial, and based on worthless phantasy. To Wolfskehl, the new land presented isolation and loneliness: 'Ich habe mir selbst Welt werden müssen, Geistesraum, Wiege des Wortes'. It is in the *Briefe aus dem Exil* that this personal world of Wolfskehl receives unique expression: and the *Briefe* themselves, (as was recently suggested by Dr J. A. Asher in his article 'Wolfskehl in Exile'—*Aumla* No. 9, November 1958) may well be considered as forming a large part of that 'dichterische Ernte und Endphase' which the poet saw in the work he completed in New Zealand. Wolfskehl met comparatively few New Zealanders and saw very little of the country. He lived, through no fault of his own, almost in a vacuum. Through these letters he seeks to maintain the links with the world he knew—descriptions of the New Zealand scene, when they enter the correspondence, are largely incidental and generally conventional.

Dr Ruben's foreword to the letters deals briefly with the aims of this publication. Wolfskehl had himself intended to publish a document of his 'exile', but a few months before his death (at the age of seventy-nine in Auckland, 1948) he entrusted this task to Dr Ruben: 'Du sollst für mich zeugen'. She has not been entirely equal to the task. She states, in the first paragraph of her foreword, that not all letters have been published: 'Ausgelassen sind Briefe oder Teile von Briefen (fehlende Stellen durch Punkte bezeichnet), die für eine Öffentlichkeit unverständlich oder ungeeignet schienen: Wiederholungen oder Mitteilungen zu persönlicher Natur.' Is this the only basis upon which Dr Ruben has selected some letters for publication and rejected others? In fact, she has not even kept to her principles in this respect—a letter to Professor Emil Preetorius, München, shows the latter in a most damaging light; for some reason or other it was not regarded as being 'too personal'. But Preetorius is only one of many recipients whose actions appear distorted in a very one-sided picture.

In publishing no less than two-hundred-and-forty-five letters (addressed to no fewer than ninety persons!) the Editor has merely brought into print a body of correspondence arranged into roughly chronological order and

Book Reviews

as she admits herself, incomplete. Surely, as the poet's 'Assistentin und nächste Vertraute durch vierzehn Jahre', Dr Ruben could have provided, in all fairness to Wolfskehl and to the recipients of his letters, at least some indication of what prompted the letters in the first place. Her foreword is in this respect totally inadequate (and distressingly subjective) as are the notes to references made in the letters. Was the Editor, after a lapse of ten years, in such haste that she could not provide explanations less fragmentary? In view of their significance, both in form and content, as one of the poet's important contributions to literature, these letters deserved a more capable editing than Dr Ruben has been able (or willing) to provide; and the sensitive, warm-hearted and brilliant Wolfskehl deserved better than this summary treatment!

University of Canterbury

A. N. BROOKS

DAS LIED VOM HURNEN SEYFRIED, edited by K. C. King. Critical Edition with Introduction and Notes. *Manchester University Press*, 1958. pp.vi+164.

ANY visitor to the *Drachenfels* in the *Siebengebirge* will come to know the story of how Siegfried slew the dragon there and liberated Kriemhild from the bondage in which the monster held her. Beneath the ruins of the old castle is a cave known as the *Drachenhöle* and the vineyards of the slope produce a claret called *Drachenblut*. Nothing of this is told in the *Nibelungenlied* which the figures of Siegfried, Kriemhild and the dragon immediately bring to mind. The only source for this part of the legend is the *Lied vom hürnen Seyfried*, an early sixteenth century text which is handed down to us in eleven slightly differing prints. The earliest of these prints, most of which are furnished with 28 woodcuts, can be dated at roughly 1530. No manuscript exists.

The poem itself, 179 stanzas each of 8 lines, in *Hiltebrandes thon*, as the first stanza tells us, shows all the elements of *Meistersinger* poetry, this debased descendant of the great mediaeval tradition. The narrative rambles along, sometimes incoherently, leaving the plot obscure in many places. The unknown author shows little if any originality in subject-matter or in poetic presentation. Thus aesthetically the work is of little interest. But from the point of view of content this last offshoot of the great Lay of the Nibelungs is of absorbing interest, and no student of this important segment of mediaeval European literature, the origin of which goes back to the great migration, can afford to neglect it.

For this reason Dr King's critical edition is most welcome. It is the most complete edition extant and renders all previous ones as well as all former critical inquiries into the subject outdated. The text is based on print K, which was not known when Dr King's most distinguished predecessor, W. Golther, edited the *Lied* in *Braunes Neudrucke* in 1889 and 1911 respectively. Print K, issued from the press of Kunegund Hergotin in Nürnberg about 1530. At the bottom of each page of Dr King's edition variants from the other prints are given, the last print dating 1642. The text of the woodcuts is reproduced in an appendix again with variants from other prints. The careful notes (pp. 159-164) refer mainly to the significance of the variants, but also to questions of meaning, structure, metre and dialect. The Introduction (103 pp. as against 50 pp. of actual text) is a masterpiece of

Book Reviews

philological exactitude, textual interpretation and historical inquiry, a happy blend so rare among Germanists in our age of specialisation.

The story deals mainly with Siegfried's youth, i.e., with adventures he had before his arrival at the Burgundian court at Worms with which the *Nibelungenlied* begins. He is the son of Sigmund, King of the Netherlands, to be sure; but as he is untamable, he is left to his own devices, becomes an apprentice to a smith who gets rid of him by sending him to fight against a dragon. He slays him, bathes in his blood and acquires a "horny" skin. Then the story becomes incoherent. In one single stanza (No. 12) we are told he goes to the court of King Gybich, to whose daughter he is married. But soon after (stanza 16 ff) we are re-introduced to the court of Worms and the story is told of how a dragon abducted Kriemhild. Then (from stanza 33) the whole story begins once more. Siegfried is introduced as if we had never heard of him before, this time as a respectable though immensely strong young man, who one day rides out, comes upon the *Trachen steyn* by chance, meets a dwarf called *Eugleine*, hears of the maiden who is in the dragon's bondage, vows to liberate her, but first defeats a giant called *Kuperan* and acquires the treasure before he fights the dragon and liberates the maiden. Two incongruities are particularly striking, one that he does not know his parents (stanza 47) and the other that Kriemhild is well known to him (stanza 51). Eventually Siegfried sets out to return Kriemhild to her father. On the way he "spills" the treasure into the Rhine. In the last nine stanzas the contents of the first part of the *Nibelungenlied* are told in a nutshell, Siegfried's marriage to Kriemhild and Siegfried's death. The latter is caused by envy of Kriemhild's brothers—no mention is made of Brunhild's part in it.

Some of the material used in the *Lied* is known from other sources, through Hagen's narration of Siegfried's previous deeds, for instance (in *Nibelungenlied* stanzas 87-100) or through Norse sagas of the thirteenth century. But the main contents of the story, the abduction and rescue of Kriemhild and the long-drawn-out fight with Kuperan are only found in the *Lied*. Dr King's main concern is to unravel the complex elements of the story, to explain the incongruous interpolations, and to find out when the otherwise unknown elements of the plot were conceived. The mainstay of his argument is a contents list of the *Nibelungenlied* contained in Ms. *m* in Darmstadt, dated c.1400. The headings of cantos 5 to 7 in *m* show that the abduction, rescue and return to Worms stories were treated in a lost version of the *Nibelungenlied* of the late fourteenth century. As the *Lied* quotes almost literally the first two stanzas of the *Rosengarten* epic (in stanzas 16 and 33) and this epic is dated c.1280, the editor concludes that a lost late mediaeval epic about the abduction and rescue story originated between 1280 and 1400 and that its content was incorporated in the above mentioned lost version of the *Nibelungenlied*. An unknown author then combined the contents of this epic with other stories, e.g. a fight with a giant and the release of dwarfs from his bondage, and merged all this with elements of the actual *Nibelungenlied* into the *Lied vom hürnen Seyfrid* between 1400 and 1500. This is the bare result of Dr King's minute inquiries. The question as to whether the germ of the rescue story is not after all found in the awakening of the maiden Brunhild through Siegfried, so widespread in the Norse tradition (*Edda*, *Völsungasaga*) is left open by Dr King because of lack of evidence. No mention at all is made in the book of Hans Sachs' *Der hürnen Seufrid. Ein Tragedij mit 17 personen* in seven acts of 1557. Hans Sachs knows the *Lied*, its content is the main content of his play, with many of the *Lied's* contradictions avoided, yet a

Book Reviews

number of other elements of Sachs' plot make one wonder whether he does not deserve a place in the argument.

In any case, to follow Dr King's line of detection is not only a pleasure, but his handling of the material adds a wealth of insight to any reader's knowledge of the larger issues, and gives this seemingly unimportant work its proper place in an ancient tradition.

University of Melbourne

RICHARD SAMUEL

LEBEN DES GALILEI: Bertolt Brecht. Edited by H. F. Brookes and C. E. Fraenkel. *London, Heinemann.* 1958, pp. 193.

SIEBEN JAHRE IN TIBET: Heinrich Harrer. Edited by A. S. Macpherson. *London, Heinemann,* pp. 215. 1958.

MESSRS HEINEMANN are to be congratulated on their production of these two useful but dissimilar texts. Brecht's *Leben des Galilei* is a drama covering a considerable period of Galileo Galilei's life, as a teacher of mathematics in Padua in 1609, Director of the Arsenal in Venice, Astronomer at the Florentine court, his recantation before the Inquisition in Rome of his theory that the earth moved round the sun, and his subsequent imprisonment by the Church until his death in 1642.

It is impossible in a short review to do justice to the complexity and background which Brecht presents, linking, as he does, the scientific thought with the spiritual doubt and social conditions, contrasting the excitement of discovery with the arrogance and ignorance of the establishment. Each of the roughly two score characters has a quite clear identity although admittedly little depth; there are moments of tension and climax. And yet in spite of all the dramatic qualities and skill, one has an uneasiness about Brecht.

'The Epic Theatre is not meant to move the reader or the spectator, it is meant to make him think, to make him draw his own conclusions.' Thus Mr Brookes or Dr Fraenkel presents Brecht's intention in a broad, sympathetic rather than critical introduction to the work. But does Brecht mean the reader to draw his own conclusions? After all, he submits only one list of candidates, so to speak. In his early works we move in a nightmare of injustice, amid characters who are impervious to reason or sentiment, painted black or white according to type and income, if any. Even in the later works, of which *Galilei* is one, where the blackness and whiteness have been toned down, Brecht makes it quite clear where our indignation should lie. Galilei is superficially like a character we might meet in any drama; he is grumpy and greedy, and on the stage he might look just like Uncle George or Mr Smith who catches the bus every morning, but by the end of the play we know this is Galilei-Brecht, meaning us to draw our own conclusions:

Nun wird der Grossteil der Bevölkerung von ihren Fürsten, Grundbesitzern und Geistlichen in einem perlmutternen Dunst von Aberglauben und alten Wörtern gehalten, welcher die Machinationen dieser Leute verdeckt. Das Elend der Vielen ist alt wie das Gebirge und wird von der Kanzel herab für unzerstörbar erklärt wie das Gebirge. Unsre neue Kunst des Zweifeln entzückte das grosse Publikum. Es riss uns das Teleskop aus der Hand und richtete es auf seine Peiniger. Diese selbstischen und gewalttätigen Männer, die sich die Früchte der Wissenschaft gierig zunutze

Book Reviews

gemacht haben, fühlten zugleich das kalte Auge der Wissenschaft auf ein tausendjähriges, aber künstliches Elend gerichtet, das deutlich beseitigt werden konnte, indem sie beseitigt wurden. Sie überschütteten uns mit Drohungen und Bestechungen, unwiderstehlich für schwache Seelen. Aber können wir uns der Menge verweigern und doch Wissenschaftler bleiben?

This is material for a poster, not a work of art. Brecht is showing us neither the source nor the processes of political action, but instead the slogans. The play is obviously most stageworthy, but as an interpretation of life it is suspect.

In spite of my reservations on the dramatist, *Galilei* is a good introduction to Brecht, particularly to his mature work, and this Heinemann edition is well printed, well bound and amazingly cheap. It can be recommended both for Sixth form reading and as a University text.

Harrer's *Sieben Jahre in Tibet*, here shortened and edited for the Upper forms of schools, is a fascinating story, full of tension and acute observation, written in a clear, modern German. Harrer, with his strong common-sense, penetrates a feudal world, at times a Kafka-like world, which he presents with great colour and sympathy. As an escaped prisoner, subject to all the caprice and coincidences of a society which he does not understand, he comes eventually to know and even dominate his surroundings. His picture of the Tibetans, their country and their customs is startlingly fresh and was deservedly a best-seller. But there is no profundity; this edition sticks to the physical actuality, illustrated by Harrer's founding of a tennis club, his winter sports and the building of a cinema projection room.

The vocabulary notes I found good, but I wondered if the 200 pages of text are perhaps not too much of one author for Antipodean schools.

University of Canterbury

T. E. CARTER

KLEINES DEUTSCHLANDBUCH FÜR AUSLANDER: RUDOLF MELDAU. Munich, Max Hueber Verlag, 1958. pp. 77.

DEUTSCHE GEGENWART. Literarisches Lesebuch für Ausländer: Gerhard Kirchoff, Munich; Max Hueber Verlag, pp. 131.

THE Max Hueber Verlag is known to most teachers of German as the publisher of the text books of the Goethe-Institut in Munich, whose language courses for foreigners I have never seen surpassed. The two books under review appear to be intended as reading material in the more advanced stages using the direct method, where in the past one has felt a lack in the Goethe-Institut course.

The first book—*Kleines Deutschlandbuch*—is a comprehensive coverage of the surface of German life, ranging from weights and measurements to the contents of one's pockets, from illnesses to television, all with scarcely a trace of humour. The vocabulary is varied, the style simple and clear, the intention excellent, but the book lacks any vitality. Here are the facts about Germany,—but it is left to the teacher to bring them to life; for example:

Fast jede Familie hat heute ein Rundfunkgerät (einen Radioapparat). Die Rundfunkgebühr ist sehr niedrig: nur DM2.—im Monat. Sie wird von der Post eingezogen, die von der Gebühr DM 1.—behält und die andere Mark an die Rundfunkgesellschaften abführt.

Book Reviews

The second book—*Deutsche Gegenwart*—is an anthology of some 35 modern pieces in prose and verse, each complete in itself. The extracts are well chosen, not only for their literary value but as an expression of the German present. It is perhaps difficult to fit such a book into our University syllabuses, where so many new names in a single work would be merely confusing, but as a Sixth form reader or for advanced language groups it is, with its variety of vocabulary and interest, first-rate. The thirty pages of notes explaining words in the text and giving the biographies of the writers seem to me unnecessary.

University of Canterbury

T. E. CARTER

CASELL'S ITALIAN-ENGLISH ENGLISH-ITALIAN DICTIONARY.
P. Rebori, F. M. Guercio, A. L. Hayward. London, Cassell, 1958. pp. xxi and 1079.

'Una gran parte della lingua italiana nei vocabolari non si trova', said Leopardi, and this will continue to be so. Whereas English is a language of homonyms, Italian is one of synonyms, or rather a language of many languages. Therefore the task of anyone who wishes to reduce its many dialects and variations of vocabulary to an appearance of cohesion is formidable, and a great deal of arbitrary choice is necessary. The first edition of Cassell's new Italian Dictionary has dealt with the problem with considerable success. Many judgments, of course, on matters of opinion, will seem arbitrary or mistaken. *Scoppola*, for instance, on the analogy of *scapaccione*, is a more acceptable form than *scopola*; and *spegnere* than *spengere* (see under *luce* p.297); as a conjunction, *appena* is more common than *appena che*; *partita* or *partita di piacere* in the sense of *divertimento* is still slang; *reale* should not be the first word in the list of equivalents of the English 'real'; *fabbricare*, not *edificare* should be the first word offered as a translation of 'build'; *giacca* should not be left so far behind *abito* as a translation of 'coat'; and to translate *barba* as 'virility' will suit so few contexts that it might well have been left out. It is unfortunate that on p.xiv *figgere* and *affiggere* are chosen as examples of the general rule that compound verbs are conjugated like their main verbs, since although *fitto*, as given here, is the more common past participle of *figgere*, we normally find *affisso* (to distinguish it from the noun *affitto*), *crocifisso*, etc.

The authors claim in their introduction to have eliminated 'ghost words' as far as possible, and the dictionary deserves credit on this account. After ten minutes of searching in another commonly used dictionary of the same size, we found in the English section 'birl', 'bislabber', (sic) 'blite', 'bobwite', 'claucht', 'frounce', 'guiser', 'rowdysh', (sic) 'samiel', 'santon', 'yerk' and 'zoril', and we are happy to report that Cassell's dictionary does not waste space on any of these. The selection of words is good, and the fact that *melone*, *sbronzo* and *carestia* are the only words which we have consciously missed in the Italian-English section shows that a satisfactorily full coverage is given. However, this work is not as good as the Cassell's German dictionary in the amount of space which it gives to quotation of phrases and examples of words to help the student. Perhaps one should not expect as much, since it is nearly two hundred pages shorter, and the type has been set in a format of ten and a half lines to the inch, instead of the twelve lines of the German dictionary, but nevertheless we feel that at the cost of a very little extra space much would have been gained; the expansion of the examples given to show the use of prepositions, for instance, one of the main obstacles

Book Reviews

to be overcome in the learning of Italian, or indeed of any language, would be most helpful; for example, it would be good to see a note on *a lungo* and *da lungo tempo* and the difference between them, to see *di là* mentioned, or to be reminded that in Italian one speaks of *cappello in testa*.

There are some misprints which should be noted here. We have found *fece* for *feci* (p.xiv), *Capella Sistina* (p.479), *una raffred-dore* for *un raffred-dore* (p.648), and the omission of the word *ragione* in line 26 of p.412. *Tribù* (p.541) is feminine and not masculine. In line 3 of p.346, *ulivo* has been printed for *uliva*. *Parecchio* (p.360) is not primarily an adverb. Admittedly one can say, with a meiosis unusual in Italian, *ho lavorato parecchio*, but the word should be described as an adjective.

These are small errors which can easily be rectified in the next edition; and we may surely hope for another before long, since this dictionary is a great improvement upon any others which have been available at a comparable price for some time. The serious student will still make use of his Orlandi, his Palazzi or his Zingarelli, but this is a most suitable work of reference for beginners, for school students, and those in the first years of university courses.

I should like to acknowledge the help given by Mr F. Vanzetti, Lecturer in Italian, University of Western Australia, in the writing of this review.

University of Western Australia

J. R. JONES

LEONARDO DA VINCI. Sir Kenneth Clark. *London, Penguin Books, 1958, pp. 181.*

SIR KENNETH CLARK occupies a unique position among art historians and critics. His peculiar gift is for aesthetic scholarship. It is based on an almost passionate sensibility of response, an unrivalled visual training under the tutelage of Roger Fry and Bernard Berenson, and the influences of C. F. Bell, who was an exacting disciplinarian, Dr Saxl and the Warburg Institute. As a young man he was deeply impressed by a lecture he had heard by Aby Warburg in Rome, an experience which prepared the way for his later close association with the Warburg Institute in London. He himself regards his Oxford lectures on European Landscape as a turning point in his life, because in them he surveyed for the first time a variety of artists and forms of expression, his first departure from a specialist field; and the influence of Ruskin and Walter Pater can also be detected in his literary persuasiveness and breadth of approach.

As an art historian he has a notable list of original contributions to his credit. He was the first to demonstrate conclusively the rococo influences on the Gothic Revival (1928); he has clarified the relationship between sacred geometry and sacred iconology in the art of Piero della Francesca by a masterly study (1951); he was the first to draw attention to the hitherto neglected but vital importance of content in French Impressionism in *Landscape into Art* (1949); and he is one of the most influential living writers to raise the discussion of classical art above the level of archaeological description to an art of historical analysis by his pioneer observations on Greek sculpture in *The Nude: A Study of Ideal Art* (1956), perhaps his greatest book.

His *Leonardo da Vinci* (1940), now made available to a wider public, is the best and most comprehensive single-volume account of the artist's life and work in any language. Its most original and valuable contribution to our

knowledge of Leonardo is the discussion of recurrent themes in his art. Some of the phenomena had been noted by scholars whose approach was mainly an iconographical one, but Clark was the first to attempt a comprehensive identification and interpretation. Once they have been pointed out—the obsession with moving water, geological formations and plant life as expressing mysterious natural forces, and with mechanical sciences, like hydrodynamics, as a means by which these forces can be rationally harnessed to man's advantage, to say nothing of the obsession with vital and psychological forces, symbolised by birds in flight, horses in action, the pointing finger, the juxtaposition of bearded old age and shaven youth—the way is clear for Clark's dual interpretation of Leonardo as a symbol of the Renaissance and a man whose psychological conflicts both released and inhibited the creative energies of genius.

I had the good fortune to be in the audience when Clark gave the six Ryerson lectures on Leonardo at Yale in 1936. They were superbly delivered to a large and enthusiastic audience. 'I have kept to the lecture form', writes Clark in his preface, 'because it alone justifies my scale and style.' The pregnant phrase, generally at the end of a sentence, where an interval of silence allows the impact to be made; the building up to a climax; and all those devices in lecturing that approximate to musical composition, like the announcement of and return to major and minor themes, can be abundantly illustrated from a text which has been carefully revised and expanded. Today the lecture room is second only to the stage as a stimulus to the influence of the spoken word on the written. Scholars who are interested in the literary presentation of their research to a more widely constituted élite than professional specialists have much to gain by studying Clark's methods in this literary as well as academic classic.

University of Melbourne

J. BURKE

IQBAL, HIS ART AND THOUGHT. Syed Abdul Wahid. *London, Murray, 1959.*

THE MESSAGE OF MILAREPA. Translated from the Tibetan by Sir Humphrey Clarke. *Wisdom of the East series. London, Murray, 1959.*

BUDDHIST SCRIPTURES. A new translation by Edward Conze. *Penguin Classics, 1959.*

EVER since Alexander invaded India more than 2000 years ago, East and West have been trying fitfully to learn from one another. If, as Grote used to say, politics and theology are the only great subjects, then Europe and Asia are well suited to supply each other's deficiencies. All the world's leading faiths are of Asian origin: no religion of any consequence has come out of Europe. All the world's leading political systems are of European origin: no political concept of universal significance has come out of Asia. Greek Bactrian kings, with all the philosophy of Plato and Aristotle behind them, sat at the feet of Buddhist sages: twenty centuries later, Pandit Nehru, a Brahmin from Kashmir, imbibed at Cambridge the political principles of Burke and Mill. The revolution now sweeping across Asia is on the political side a bold and perilous grafting of European institutions and modes of thought, from Marxian Communism to parliamentary democracy, on ancient peasant societies to which self-government beyond the village meeting level was unknown and whose only political theory was

that of passive obedience. Yet the leaders of many of the new Asian nations are conscious of the need to preserve or construct some moral breakwater against the flood from the West, and are striving to utilise to that end their rich spiritual heritage. One of the most astonishing developments since the collapse of European domination in Asia has been the recrudescence of Buddhism: in Burma and Ceylon it has awakened to powerful life, it is tolerated even in Communist China, and its votaries or sympathisers are seemingly multiplying in the West.

Buddhism was the last of the great universal faiths to become known in Europe, where it has always been regarded with a sort of respectful curiosity. That which is strange and unfamiliar may puzzle but not commonly repel: what we most dislike is things which have the appearance of being caricatures of our own creed. To one brought up in the Christian-Hellenic tradition, Judaism will appear parochial, and Islam a kind of unitarian Christianity which boggles at the Trinity. But Buddhism is likely to appeal to those whose Christian beliefs have been undermined by rationalism and Biblical criticism as well as to those whose faith in science, which burned so brightly in agnostic minds in the age of Darwin, has been dimmed by the horrifying prospect of nuclear destruction. Here is a faith which avoids adherence to rigid creeds, whose beliefs have not to be painfully adjusted to the supposed findings of modern science, which rejects all speculation about God and the soul, proclaims the Dharma or moral law the one fixed reality in a universe of illusion, and teaches that desire, the source of all evil, can be overcome by strenuous moral endeavour of penance and self-discipline, so that the disciple finally escapes from the sorrowful wheel of existence and attains Nirvana, a profound conception signifying not mere emptiness but the repose of peaceful serenity. The inquirer who wishes to learn about Buddhism at first hand is daunted by the sheer volume of its sacred writings, a huge amorphous mass of literature, part prose, part verse, choked with bewildering technical terms, and prolific in dull platitudes as well as deep wisdom. They lack the rich variety and vivid interest of the Bible, a library of legend, history, prophecy and sacred song, and the compact unity of the Koran, the reflection of the mind of a single man of genius. Few of them go back to the earliest days; none can be dated with certainty, and the bulk of them were put together long after the Founder's death. But here in a Penguin volume of 250 pages is the cream of them, ably clothed in English dress: here are the classic legends of the Buddha, his flight from home, his enlightenment under the bo-tree, and his sermon in the deer-park at Sarnath, which expounds the four holy truths and points out the eight-fold path to deliverance. Here are the answers of the monk Nagasena to the questions of King Milinda, the Menander of the Bactrian Greeks, who sought like many a Westerner to learn from the wise men of the East. From this well-chosen selection of texts much of the spirit and flavour of the Buddhist faith may be caught and savoured by the curious outsider anxious to know by what rule millions of Asians have guided their lives during the last two and a half millennia.

Spengler sneered at Buddhism as a 'fellow-religion' on the ground that from being a profound and noble philosophy it speedily got caught up in popular corruptions and superstitions, until the peasant masses came to worship the Buddha as a god in a debasing atmosphere of idols, incense and prayer-wheels. Certainly, the primitive ritualistic Buddhism of Tibet would seem to be far removed from the spirit and practice of the Founder, yet the little volume of poems by the twelfth century Tibetan sage Milarepa, translated by Sir Humphrey Clarke in the 'Wisdom of the East' series,

expresses a genuine devotion somewhat reminiscent of George Herbert, when due allowance has been made for the difference between an English parsonage and a Tibetan lamasery. According to the life or legend of Milarepa, he was despoiled of his patrimony by a wicked uncle, whereupon he sought the aid of sorcerers in conjuring up a hailstorm which destroyed the house and crops of his dishonest relative, but he repented of this act of revenge, placed himself under the stern discipline of a holy man, and finally attained enlightenment in the mountain solitudes. His translator styles him the St. Francis of Tibet, but though he shares with the Povrello a happy piety and a love of nature, the active and overwhelming charity of Assisi is missing from this picture of the world-renouncing hermit. Perhaps this is the essential difference between the sage and the saint.

After Buddhism, the religion which has made the strongest appeal to Asians is that of Islam, and the emergence in recent years of two new Muslim States, Pakistan and Indonesia, has reminded us that the teachings of the Arab Prophet are still a force in the world of unknown magnitude. Pakistan is in effect the creation of Muhammad Iqbal, from whose brain it sprang as much as Israel from that of Theodore Herzl. His countryman, Syed Abdul Wahid, has re-published in a revised form a study of Iqbal's art and thought which he privately printed in 1944. Most of the book is devoted to an assessment of Iqbal as a poet, with extensive quotations from his lyrics, elegies, satires and *mathnawis* or philosophical pieces which he composed with equal versatility in Urdu and Persian, and an interesting chapter traces the influence on Iqbal of Milton (both Cambridge men, as the author reminds us!) But though he once contemplated writing a great poem on the model of *Paradise Lost*, he clearly based his most ambitious effort, the *Javid Namah*, on Dante's *Divine Comedy*: in this Persian epic the poet journeys through the cosmos and visits the planets in company with his Virgil, the Persian mystic Rumi, who assures him that the future hope of mankind lies in a synthesis of Eastern and Western cultures. Admirable in theory, and in this Iqbal was at one with a good many Indian intellectuals, but when we look a little more closely into the matter, we find it hard to determine exactly what 'Eastern culture' is. It is clear from Iqbal's own writings that the gulf between Islam and Buddhism is far wider than that between Islam and Christianity. Iqbal has no use for Buddhist detachment and renunciation: once we come to treat the world as an illusion, our capacity for action is paralysed, and we squat down and contemplate our navels. He impatiently sweeps this away as escapist, a flight from life and responsibility: one imagines him glancing with distaste at the passive brooding Buddhas one encounters all over Southern Asia. With a God-centred religion like Islam, Buddhist agnosticism has nothing in common: indeed Iqbal was convinced that the decay and stagnation which had overtaken the Muslim world since the Middle Ages was to be traced to the insidious poison of neo-Platonism, and gnostic mysticisms which have so many affinities with the faiths of old India. He sought salvation in the unique and tremendous God of Islam, in the positive and active mysticism of Rumi and the sufis, and in the dynamic philosophy of the West. He found much to admire in Nietzsche and Bergson, whose teachings were fashionable in the days of Iqbal's youth and early manhood, but in the last resort the chief fount of wisdom was the Koran, which enjoins, he never tired in pointing out, that none can bear the burden of another. Syed Abdul Wahid makes little reference to Iqbal's most famous book, *The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam* (1928), perhaps because he thinks enough has been said about it already, perhaps because its theses are as disturbing to Muslim orthodoxy as

those of Erasmus were to Tridentine Catholicism. Intellectually, Islam is still in the doldrums: Iqbal may point a way out in some future age, but the time is not yet. What is reasonably certain is that no accommodation is ever likely to be reached between the two faiths which dominate Asia. The temple and the mosque are poles apart. We can see now why Pakistan had to be: the Indian Muslims could never submit to be swallowed up in the vast ocean of world-renouncing Hindu-Buddhism. The great religions, as Iqbal noted, are either Indian or Semitic. Islam, with its Christian and Jewish background, belongs to the Western tradition, or perhaps we should say, the West-Asian tradition. The East-Asian is wholly different, and these books reveal that Oriental religious culture is no unity but consists of at least two irreconcilable types. On one level, and that not the least important, there will never be 'One World.'

University of Canterbury

J. J. SAUNDERS

NOTES

THE THIRD CONGRESS OF THE 'SOCIÉTÉ FRANCAISE DE LITTÉRATURE COMPARÉE'.

THIS was held from the 1st to the 3rd of June 1959 at Dijon, the charming former capital of Burgundy, rich in natural beauty and historical memories. There every step is a reminder of the wealth of the ancient Burgundian Empire and the artists who created masterpieces perpetuating its glory.

Under the presidency of Professor Marcel Ba'taillon, *Administrateur du Collège de France*, a lecture programme with three different themes, specially suited to this city, had been devised:

- 1 Les écrivains et les artistes de Bourgogne au XVIIIe siècle et leurs relations étrangères.—
- 2 La Suisse dans la littérature française au XVIIIe siècle.—
- 3 Les académies provinciales et leurs relations étrangères au XVIIIe siècle.

The Teaching of Comparative Literature holds an important place in many French Universities: Dijon was the fourth university to have introduced a "Institut de Littérature Comparée."

M. Marcel Bouchard, (*Recteur, président du conseil de l'Université de Dijon*) in his opening address spoke of 'La vie littéraire de Dijon au XVIIIe siècle'. The following are a choice from a variety of interesting papers:

- M. J. Voisine, professeur à la Faculté des Lettres de Lille: 'Dijon étape du grand tour. Impressions d'écrivains anglais au XVIIIe siècle.'
- M. Fr. Jost, professeur à l'Université de Fribourg: 'Le thème de Guillaume Tell dans la littérature française au XVIIIe siècle.'
- M. Charly Guyot, Vice-Recteur de l'Université de Neuchâtel: 'La Suisse dans l'Encyclopédie.'
- M. Pierre Moreau, professeur à la Sorbonne: 'La mode du voyage en Suisse.'
- M. Trénard, professeur à la Faculté de Lettres de Lille: 'L'Académie de Lyon et ses relations étrangères au XVIIIe siècle.'

Besides the considerable number of members from all over France there

Notes

were Belgian, Dutch, Swiss visitors and one from Australia. A visit to the Palace of the Dukes of Burgundy and the Place Royale, both remodelled by Hardouin-Mansart, to the Townhall and to the Hôtel de Voguë, dating from the beginning of the XVIIth century, was of much interest. At night the Municipal Authorities specially opened the floodlit Museum to the *Congressistes*, who were received and shown round by the 'conservateur.' This collection is considered the richest one in provincial France, containing the beautiful tomb of 'Jean sans Peur' with its eighty mourners in alabaster, many paintings of the *Primitifs*, the sculpture of Francois Rude and a multitude of other treasures, e.g.: the modern animal sculpture of François Pompon.

In the gracious traditional manner of France we were received by the University and Municipal Authorities, treated to delicious Burgundian specialities at sumptuous meals and offered numerous 'vins d'honneur': the most picturesque being the one presented by the Chanoine Kir, (*député-maire de Dijon*), under the arched ceiling in the ducal kitchens of the Palace. Speaking the French "du terroir", the French of the Burgundian peasant, he stressed the importance of our meeting for a general understanding between nations and the suitability of Dijon, a town so close to the frontier.

Finally the members of the Congress were the guests of the "Education Nationale" authorities on a most pleasant bus trip through the green undulating countryside around Dijon. Stops were made at the enchanting castle of Bussy-Rabutin, with its Mme de Sévigné memories, at the Cistercian abbey of Fontenay with its superb cloisters, at Montbard with its Buffon *cabinet* and tower, at Les Laumes and at picturesque Semur-en-Auxois, a small walled-in town with many historical buildings entirely preserved.

This Congress of three delightful days was organized by M. René Ternois and M. Claude Pichois and their helpers.

HILDE BURGER

FOR THE AUSTRALIAN PLAYWRIGHT

A collection of scripts of unpublished plays by Australians is being made for the Fryer Memorial Library (an all-Australian library) at Queensland University.

Playwrights are invited to send scripts to Miss Eunice Hanger, of the English Department, University of Queensland, St. Lucia, Brisbane, for consideration and possible inclusion in the Fryer collection. Scripts sent will, if they warrant inclusion, be copied and returned without delay to the authors.

The intention is to preserve for the record any play that has merit of any kind, and not to exclude plays because they are not meritorious on every count. Authors are therefore urged to submit their scripts without diffidence, and are assured that no improper use, by infringement of rights or unauthorised publicity, will be made of them.

The library collection will be properly indexed and catalogued, and be available to research students and others concerned with the development of Australian drama.

Eunice Hanger,
English Dept.,
University of Qld.
St. Lucia
Brisbane.

AUMLA INDEX Nos. 10-12 1959

ARTICLES AND NOTES

- Austin, L. J. *Le 'Cantique de Saint Jean' de Stéphane Mallarmé*, 10, 46.
- Benn, M. B. *Bert Brecht's Hitler, A Stuttgart Production of 'The Resistible Rise of Arturo Ui'*, 11, 48.
- Bibliography of the Work of A. R. Chisholm 10, 171.
- Brooks, A. N. *Oswald von Wolkenstein and 'Minnesangs Herbst'*, 12, 45.
- Burger, Hilde. *Eine Bescheidene Widmung*, 10, 14.
- Cain, Virgil J. *The Spanish Classical Theatre*, 10, 71.
- Canart, P. L. *Aspects of 'Avant'*, 10, 81.
- Chisholm, A. R. *Mallarmé: 'Quelle soie aux baumes de temps' (1885)*, 12, 17.
- Cohen, Gustave. *Valéry expliqué devant Valéry*, 10, 28.
- Conlon, P. M. *A Bicentenary: Voltaire's 'Candide'. 1759-1959*, 12, 20.
- Cornell, J. G. *Apologia pro Exegetice*, 10, 21.
- Dale, A. M. *Ethos and Dianoia: 'Character' and 'Thought' in Aristotle's 'Poetics'*, 11, 3.
- Davies, W. Gardner. *An Exegesis of Mallarmé's 'M'introduire dans ton histoire'*, 10, 32.
- Denat, Antoine. *L'art poétique après Valéry*, 11, 63.
- French, A. *The Phonetic Affiliations of Czech*, 12, 58.
- Gellie, G. H. *A Comment on Petronius*, 10, 89.
- Krispyn, E. *Sources and Subject Matter in Two Short Stories by Georg Heym*, 12, 52.
- Laufer, R. *An Attempt to Explain the Tendency towards the Disappearance of the æ Phoneme in Modern French*, 11, 82.
- Lawler, James R. *A. R. Chisholm*, 10, 5; *A Reading of Valéry's 'Palme'* 10, 60.
- Leopold, Keith. *Franz Kafka's Stories in the First Person*, 11, 56.
- Lonie, I. M. *Propertius and the Alexandrians*, 11, 17.
- Macartney, Keith. *A Letter From London*, 10, 10.
- Maxwell, Ian R. *Beauty is Truth*, 10, 100.
- Quincey, J. H. *The New Menander: An Interim Report*, 12, 3.
- Randall, Jean M. *Antoine Fauchery, a Friend of Baudelaire*, 10, 109.
- Scott, S. J. *The Mythology of the Tree in 'Les Contemplations'*, 10, 120.
- Smith, Ian H. *'Le Rêve de D'Alembert' and 'De Rerum Natura'*, 10, 128.
- Stirling, Alfred. *Professor A. R. Chisholm*, 10, 9.
- Stokes, Edward. *Elizabeth Bowen—Pre-Assumptions or Moral Angle?* 11, 35.
- Sussex, R. T. *Marie Mauron and Provence*, 10, 135; *Léon Cladel and Quercy*, 12, 30.
- Tauman, Léon. *Le Langage de l'Art*, 10, 142.

Index

- Treloar, Bronnie. *Some Feminist Views in France in the Seventeenth Century*, 10, 152.
- Triebel, L. A. *A Second Royais*, 10, 160.
- Van Abbe, D. M. *What is Fastnachtspiel?* 12, 36.
- Wykes, Olive. *The Direct Method Experiment in the Teaching of French in New South Wales*, 10, 164.

BOOK REVIEWS

- Arnott, Peter D. *An Introduction to the Greek Theatre*, 12, 73.
- Apollonius of Rhodes. *The Voyage of Argo* (tr.), 11, 94.
- Aspects of Translation*, 11, 115.
- Batt, Jean C. *French Pronunciation and Diction*, 11, 108.
- Bottrall, Margaret. *Everyman a Phoenix*, 11, 99.
- Braun, Sidney D. *Dictionary of French Literature*, 11, 105.
- Brecht, Bertold. *Leben des Galilei*, 12, 95.
- Cassell's Italian-English, English-Italian Dictionary* (ed. Robora, Guercio, Hayward), 12, 97.
- Chiari, Joseph (ed.). *The Harrap Anthology of French Poetry*, 12, 82.
- Clark, Kenneth. *Leonardo da Vinci*, 12, 98.
- Clarke, Humphrey. (tr.) *The Message of Milarepa*, 12, 99.
- Conze, Edward. (tr.) *Buddhist Scriptures*, 12, 99.
- Davies, W. Gardner. *Mallarmé et le drame solaire*, 12, 84.
- Harrer, Heinrich. *Sieben Jahre in Tibet*, 12, 95.
- Harvey, P. and Heseltine, J. E. *The Oxford Companion to French Literature*, 11, 105.
- Hatto, A. T. and Taylor, R. J. *The Songs of Neidhart von Reuentel*, 11, 112.
- Heiseler, Bernt von. *Schiller: Leben und Werk*, 12, 87.
- Heller, Erich. *The Ironic German. A Study of Thomas Mann*, 11, 110.
- Highet, Gilbert. *Poets in a Landscape*, 12, 76.
- Horsman, E. A. *Dickens and the Structure of the Novel*, 12, 78.
- Huysmans, J. K. *Against Nature*, (tr.) 11, 102.
- Kidd, D. A. *Roman Attitudes to Education*, 11, 96.
- King, K. C. (ed.) *Das Lied vom Hurnen Seyfried*, 12, 93.
- Kirchoff, Gerhard. *Deutsche Gegenwart*, 12, 96.
- Mason, Germaine. *A Concise Survey of French Literature*, 12, 81.
- Meldau, Rudolf. *Kleines Deutschlandbuch für Ausländer*, 12, 96.
- Norrish, P. J. *Drama of the Group*, 11, 109.
- Peacock, Ronald. *Goethe's Major Plays*, 12, 85.
- Press, John. *Andrew Marvell*, 11, 101.
- Reid, T. B. W. (ed.) *Twelve Fabliaux*, 11, 104.
- Robertson, J. G. *A History of German Literature* (3rd ed.), 12, 89.

Index

- Saaz, Johannes von. *Death and the Plowman* (tr.), 11, 111.
- Stalknecht, N. P. *Strange Seas of Thought: Studies in William Wordsworth's Philosophy of Man and Nature*, 11, 98.
- Sullivan, John. *G. K. Chesterton: a Bibliography*, 12, 79.
- Syme, Ronald. *Tacitus*, 11, 93.
- Taylor, Aline (ed.) *Tulane Studies in English*, 12, 80.
- Vahid, Syed Abdul. *Iqbal, His Art and Thought*, 12, 99.
- Vedeckem Poznani Soudobych Jazyku*, O. 11, 113.
- Webster, T. B. L. *Greek Art and Literature 700-530 B.C.*, 12, 75.
- Wolfskehl, Karl. *Zehn Jahre Exil: Briefe aus Neuseeland 1938-1948*, 12, 91.

Simple French Readers

VINGT MILLE LIEUES SOUS LES MERS

Jules Verne

Abridged and adapted by Marie-Pierre Castelnau

This abridged text in a series of well-known, exciting stories is suitable for beginners in all types of Secondary Schools, and particularly in classes where no very detailed and academic study of French is contemplated. Illustrated. 3s 6d

SOUCOUPES VOLANTES

R. N. Allan

This simple French reader is suitable for the first two years in Preparatory Schools and all types of Secondary Schools. The amusing story will appeal to the pupils' interest in science fiction. Each chapter is followed by questions and exercises.

Lively illustrations. 3s 6d

FRANCOIS ET L'ARMEE SECRETE

Daniel Roberts

This true adventure story of the Resistance movement in the French Alps during the Second World War was serialised in 'Carrousel' and is now published in book form in response to many requests. It is an account of the author's own adventures as a lad.

Limp liason 7s 3d

MACMILLAN

34-35 FLINDERS ST., MELBOURNE, C.1